University of Montana
ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers

Graduate School

1985

American strategic policy and Iranian political development 1943-1979

Mohsen Shabdar
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd
Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation
Shabdar, Mohsen, "American strategic policy and Iranian political development 1943-1979" (1985). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 5189.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/5189

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1976

THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED MANUSCRIPT IN WHICH COPYRIGHT SUBSISTS. ANY FURTHER REPRINTING OF ITS CONTENTS MUST BE APPROVED BY THE AUTHOR.

MANSFIELD LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
DATE: 1985

AMERICAN STRATEGIC POLICY

AND

IRANIAN POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

1943-1979

By

Mohsen Shabdar

B.A., Rocky Mountain College, 1983

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

1985

Approved by:

Chairman, Board of Examiners

Dean, Graduate School

2/21/85

Date

UMI Number: EP40653

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI EP40653
Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

3-5-85

Shabdar, Mohsen, M.A., February 1985 Political Science

American Strategic Policy and Iranian Political Development 1943-1979 (118 pp.)

Director: Louis Hayes

The British withdrawal from the Middle East after World War II and the communist expansion in the area made the United States adopt a new strategic policy. The purpose of this study is to explain why Iran became important in American strategic policy and how this policy affected Iranian political development. The scope of this thesis is centered upon the importance of Iran and the Shah's regime in American strategic policy throughout the Persian Gulf region. The study is focused on the shifts in American strategic policy which had both positive and negative impacts on the Iranian government in the period between 1943-1979.

In 1941, Anglo-Russian forces invaded Iran and split the country into two spheres of influence. It was during the war that the United States was attracted to that country. The first shift in American strategic policy occurred when the United States recognized the importance of Iran's location in the Persian Gulf and her natural resources. Before that, American foreign policy was based on traditional non-involvement policy. The American government seriously thought about a way to help Iran. During the war America stayed neutral in Iran because of its alliance with the Soviets and the British. During this period, America helped Iran economically. Also, United States diplomacy was critical in helping Iran regain its independence.

During the second shift, the American involvement in Iran became clearer and America supported Iran openly. The strength of American-Iranian relations reached a peak during this period. Because of the Cold War and the Soviet-American struggle over the Third World, the United States not only continued its economic support of Iran, but also started modernizing the Iranian armed forces. In this shift, the Shah established his absolute power in Iran. He enjoyed total American support for his regime.

The third shift occurred when President Carter introduced his human-rights policy. This policy, along with factionalism and disorganization within the Carter administration, had a big impact on the pre-revolutionary political development in Iran.

American strategic policy served the Shah's own ambitions. The shifts in this policy, along with the Shah's way of ruling, created an atmosphere of anti-Shah feeling. A combination of internal and external factors caused the Shah's downfall. The Iranian example offers a good lesson for the future American foreign policy in the Middle East.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Iran's strategic importance, enhanced during World War II by its increasing significance as a major source of world oil, has stimulated the superpowers (Britain and the Soviet Union), to seek domination over the country in order to strengthen their security as well as their political and economic interests in the context of changing world politics. The race to control the Middle East pushed the superpowers into a serious confrontation. In the late 1940's the growing Soviet expansionism and the liquidation of British positions throughout the Middle East forced the United States to fill the vacuum and to formulate policy for the entire area. America's response to the Soviet expansion was the Truman Doctrine of March, 1946. This doctrine was acclaimed by the Iranians as a further demonstration of the American interest in their security. The purpose of this paper is to describe the nature and objectives of American strategic policy, and the assumptions upon which they have been based after World War II. This policy has shifted three times. These shifts have had great impact on Iranian political development between the period of 1943-1979.

Before the first shift, American foreign policy was based on a traditional non-involvement policy. By the emergence of World War II and the alliance with Britain and the Soviet Union, the United States became involved in the war. This involvement signaled a change in American foreign policy. After the war, hostile Soviet behavior in Europe became yet another reason for the gradual shift in American policy and public opinion.

The first shift occurred during World War II when Anglo-Russian forces jointly invaded and occupied Iran, exiled the Shah, and installed his son, Mohammed Reza Shah as Monarch. The United States was neutral during the invasion. This neutrality changed to a supportive policy when the young Shah managed to gain President Roosevelt's support for the guarantee of Iranian territorial integrity and political independence.

Because of the wartime alliance, President Roosevelt wanted to keep America's cooperation with the allies, and at the same time, to support Iran's territorial integrity. For that reason, the president, during the Tehran Conference, asked the allies for Iran's independence. Roosevelt's request resulted in the Tehran Declaration. In that declaration the three great powers promised to preserve Iran's unity and independence.

The second shift in the American strategic policy occurred when the United States Government openly supported the Shah and his government. The reason for this new shift in American policy was because of the oil, Iran's strategic location in the Persian Gulf, and the Cold War. The 1940's are known as the beginning of the Cold War era. Because of the continued communist threat throughout the Third World, the United States adopted the Point Four Plan. It was a term applied to technical cooperation programs of the United States which assisted the Third World from 1950 throughout 1965. The plan put special emphasis on Iran.

American technical cooperation helped the Iranian economy. This second shift of American strategic policy also concentrated on the Iranian armed forces. The Americans may have concluded that the Iranian military, properly armed, trained, and indoctrinated, could act as a

stabilizing force with or without the Monarchy. Thus, America started its biggest arms sale in Iran's history. There were many reasons for the arms sale, including financial gain and the desire to keep Gulf nations out of communist hands.

The nationalization of the Iranian oil industry, and the emergence of Dr. Mohammed Mossadeq to power in Iran (1951-1953), stopped the American impact for a while. The nationalization was a real threat to the Anglo-American oil companies throughout the Persian Gulf. The United States feared that Iran, with its huge oil reserves, might fall into Communist hands. Also, because of Mossadeq's inflexibility, and Communist penetration throughout Iran, the U.S. Government supported Mossadeq's opponents. These opponents were compounded from the Shah, military officers and the Anglo Iranian Oil Company (AIOC). These opponents succeeded, finally, in 1953 to overthrow Mossadeq.

The final shift in American strategic policy occurred during the Carter Administration. President Carter adopted the human rights policy. He attempted to reduce the level of military assistance to Iran, while simultaneously increasing appropriations in the area of economic and humanitarian assistance. This policy, along with the conflict within the Carter Administration itself (about the Iranian Crisis), had a great impact on the political development in Iran.

The scope of this thesis centers upon American Strategic Policy and its impact upon Iranian politics (1943-1979). The first and second shifts had a positive impact on the solidification and stabilization of Iranian government, while in contrast, the third had a negative impact.

The research will be on two levels. First, the research will consider briefly the history of Iran's importance in American strategic policy. Second, the research will focus specifically on the impact of American strategic policy on Iranian domestic politics.

The information which has been used in this research was generated from both primary and secondary sources, such as U.S. government documents, books, the academic journals, and the author's personal experience.

II. THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE IRANIAN SITUATION BEFORE AND DURING WORLD WAR II

Persia (or Iran) with its twenty-five hundred year history, had a great impact in the development of the history of civilization. Iran had produced a great and innovative civilization that dared to dream of conquering all the known world. It had defeated the dreaded Assyrians, built one of the strongest empires, and had come close to conquering Greece. By contrast, this empire, in the Twentieth Century, was weak and unable to protect even its own territorial integrity. Because of the Anglo-Russian imperialistic aggression in Iran, the country barely seemed able to survive as an independent nation.[1]

From the beginning of his emergence to power in Iran, Reza Shah liked neither the British nor the Russians. Yet, he cooperated with the British to solve some of the socio-economic problems which were facing Iran. Reza Shah ruled Iran until 1941, and produced a strong dictatorial reformist regime that strengthened the internal politics of Iran against Anglo-Soviet rivalry. His main goal was to reduce Iran's dependence on Britain and the Soviet Union, and hence, insulate it from their rivalry.[2] To reach his goal, Reza Shah was looking for new friends in the western world to depend on. In the late 1930's Reza Shah approached the United States and then Germany for assistance.

In his search for closer ties with a third power, Reza Shah preferred the United States. The reason for his choice was that he thought America was a geographically distant and largely a non-colonial power, presumably less ready than others to intervene in Iranian affairs. Reza Shah wanted Persia to take its rightful place in the glittering new

century of industrialization, science, national pride, and, of course, he wanted to create a strong monarchial system for his son. He assumed that America, with its growing power and yet no national interest in Persia's resources, might come to some special, beneficial role in rescuing Persia from its humiliating servitude.[3]

Reza Shah thought that the best way to "reach" a unification with the Americans was by involving American oil companies in Iranian oil industry. Tehran arranged a visit for a representative of the Standard Oil Company in December 1937. This attempt failed because the State Department disassociated the U.S. Government from the mission.[4] The reasons for the State Department's reaction were the United States' belief in a policy of "low-key" involvement in the world affairs at that time and the recognition that the particular region in the world was traditionally a British sphere of influence.[5]

After Iran's early request for American assistance failed, Reza Shah turned to the Germans for help. The rise of Germany as a nationalist and anti-British power had impressed Reza Shah, as it had many other nationalist governments and movements in Asia and the Middle East.[6] Reza Shah hated the British influence, and the British were unpopular with Iranian nationalists. This hostility, combined with a German drive for economic and political influence in Iran, led to the development of German-Iranian friendship in the 1930s. In return for strengthening their relationship with Iran, Nazi ideology declared Iran as a pure Aryan country. They bestowed on the Persians, the honor of Aryan status and expanded trade between the two nations.[7] By the late 1930s, more than six hundred German experts had been employed in various industrial,

commercial, and educational projects in Iran. Trade developed rapidly, and "by 1938 Germany accounted for 41 percent of the total foreign trade of Iran."[8] German firms had a large role in the Trans-Iranian Railroad. The Germans opened sea and air communication with Iran and provided most of the machinery and contractors in Iran's industrial, mining and building program. Berlin also flooded Iran with agents and propaganda.

The real reason for this "generous" German assistance to Iran was not because of Iran's Aryan status. It was because Germany saw Iran as a good base against the Soviet Union, a way to weaken the British position throughout the Middle East, and a vast supply of oil and other natural resources.

On the eve of World War II, Iran housed German economic and political agents because the Iranian government had economic and political commitments tying it to a pro-German policy. Britain and the Soviet Union were alarmed and saw the Iranian-German friendship as a threat to their interests throughout the region. These two traditional rivals, Britain and the Soviet Union, entered a wartime alliance against Germany.[9] They were looking for a new way to aid Russians who were under heavy pressure from the advancing German forces. Thus, they chose Iran for that purpose, by requesting Reza Shah to use Iran as a bridge to transport the American supplies to Russia. He rejected the Anglo-Russian request.[10] The Shah declared Iran's neutrality in the War. This Iranian action made the allies waste no more time; they invaded Iran.

In September, 1941, the Anglo-Russian forces invaded Iran from the south and the north.[11] Iran was divided into three zones by the British and Russians. Soviet troops were in the north and British troops in the

south, while Tehran and other important areas were provisionally placed under joint protection of the two powers. The occupying forces also exiled the Shah, and installed his son, Mohammed Reza, as Monarch. In January, 1942, Great Britain, Iran, and the Soviet Union signed an Alliance. The Allies guaranteed to help "safeguard" Iran's economy from negative effects of the war and to withdraw their troops from Iran within a six-month time period.[12]

The Anglo-Russian invasion brought disaster to Iran. Inflation, famine, deterioration of the modern sector, and disruption of government finance were a direct result of the occupation. Iran was humiliated. It lost its sovereignty. The conduct of its domestic and foreign affairs was directly subjected to the dictates of the occupying forces. Iran sank into growing social disorder, political disarray, and economic hardship. Many social and political groups, including tribes, appeared in the Iranian political scene with demands for domestic reforms and tribal autonomy. Some followed the British and some the Soviets. The Anglo-Russian powers in Iran, on the other hand, were using their favored social and political groups and tribes against each other.[13]

An important development that occurred because of the allies' occupation in Iran was the formation of the nationalist movement. This movement developed rapidly and was supported by those Iranians who were anxious because of the chaotic domestic situation as well as the humiliation and instability that Iran had suffered at the hands of foreign powers. There was also an increase in urbanization. Competing groups and ideologies -- nationalist, religious, and socialist -- vied for the allegiance of Iranians as never before.[14]

The Soviets signed an agreement with Great Britain and Iran. According to that agreement, the Soviets promised to withdraw from Iran. After the War ended, the Soviets had no intention whatsoever of leaving Iran. The Soviets now found the opportunity to solve their Iranian problem once and for all; they began the "Sovietization" of northern Iran. The Russians closed their zone of occupation to free entry and put it under severe restrictions. To enter the Soviet Zone there was a need for special passes from the Soviet Embassy in Tehran.[15]

In the meantime, the Soviets revived and strengthened Iran's Communist Party. In his campaign against all organized opposition, Reza Shah had banned the Communist Party in 1937. But under Soviet pressure in 1941, fifty-two leading members of the party were released from prison, and soon after, reorganized the party and renamed it Tudeh (the mass), with its base in the Soviet Zone.[16]

The Tudeh Party was a major critic of the Tehran government. They opposed the institution of Monarchy, and the British presence and interference in Iran. It advocated socialist reform and autonomy for the provinces of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan, with which the Soviets shared a common geographical, ethnic, and religious background. Eventually, the Tudeh and the Kurds succeeded in establishing two autonomous regimes in Azerbarijan and Kurdistan.[17] This "separation" threatened the Iranian territorial integrity, and its national unity. This was the situation when the Shah Mohammed Reza, who was 21 years old, came to power in Iran.

Immediately after his emergence to power in Iran, the young Shah felt that the only solution for the Iranian crisis was American support. Thus, he turned to the United States for guarantees and support. Although

he could not convince Washington to try to end the Soviet occupation, he hoped to use American prestige to pressure the Allies.

III. AMERICAN STRATEGIC POLICY

From the turn of the twentieth century until the great depression of the 1930s, American foreign policy had been affected by the Monroe Doctrine. America lived in semi-isolation, far away from the eastern hemisphere. Before World War II, America's approach to the external world vacillated between periods of isolationist withdrawal and periods of global involvement.

World War II changed America's isolationism. The war constituted an episode that both crystallized a mood and acted as a catalyst for it; that resolved contradictions between the "isolationist" and the "internationalist" and helped clarify values; that set in motion a wave of events that eventually engulfed a nation and forced it to reach a consensus about its role. Describing the American attitude in this period, Gabriel Almond in his The American People and Foreign Policy (1950), wrote that the American people have not only had to accept world leadership, but also had to learn how to contend with an opponent who subordinates all values to power. Almond called American foreign policy, the foreign policy of "consensus" which aimed for a resistance to communist expansion, by economic, diplomatic, propaganda, and military means.[18]

With its entry into the war, the United States was transformed to superpower status. America emerged from the war with extraordinary powers and a new sense of global responsibility. To meet with the "new" American role in world politics, America's leaders plunged into the job of shaping the world into a mold suitable for American security and interest. Charles W. Icegley, in his American Foreign Policy (1979) said, "The free people of the world look to us for support in maintaining

their freedom. If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world--and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our nation."[19]

Because of its global responsibility, the U.S. became active in nearly every sphere of international relations. America was the primary sponsor of the United Nations. America pushed for the expansion of foreign trade, the development of new markets for American products and the creation of complex alliances in Europe and the Third World.

American foreign policy after World War II was generally anti-communist in nature. The reason for this American attitude toward the communists was because American policy-makers assumed that communism was an expansionist, crusading ideology intent on converting the entire world to its beliefs. Moreover, communist ideology was totalitarian and anti-democratic, and therefore, a real threat to freedom and liberty throughout the world.

A good example of a person with such an attitude was John Foster Dulles, who believed the communist was a "devil." In order to thwart adventurism, Dulles suggested that the U.S. lead an ideological crusade with the ultimate goal of reform of the "evil-doers" and the eventual triumph of democracy. Dulles' principal policy was, however, the policy of "brinkmanship." The U.S. must not only have the military capability, but it must also have the will to carry out such a policy, while at the same time, negotiating for a mutual and reciprocal renunciation of force, except in self-defense.[20]

The friendly wartime relationship between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. shattered as the Soviet Union expanded into Eastern and Central Europe.

By the end of World War II, it became obvious that the world of the Yalta Declaration, in which the Soviets had committed themselves to free elections and democratic governments in Eastern Europe, had become meaningless. Explaining the reasons behind this Soviet aggression, George F. Kennan wrote that the Soviet leaders were insecure about their political ability to maintain power against forces both within Soviet society itself and in the outside world. This insecurity would lead to an activits--and perhaps hostile--Soviet foreign policy.[21]

The Americans felt that they were responsible for the replacement of the British in the Middle East (after Britain's withdrawal) from the area), to keep the power balanced. The Americans saw the Soviet expansion throughout the Third World as a threat to the balance of power. Washington feared that Soviet communism would be able to present itself as a successful model of modernization for the new nations seeking to enter into industrial modernization. Thus, communism was not just a military threat, but also an ideological threat in the newly politically aware and poor area of the Middle East. For the people of this area, communism was attractive because it appeared to promise a fairly rapid and disciplined way of bringing about political, social, economic, and cultural changes.[22]

The internal difficulties of the Third World contries in general, and specifically Middle Eastern ones, attracted the Soviet Union and the United States and led them to a dangerous confrontation. This confrontation, which developed after World War II, was also known as the Cold War. Because of the balance of power, and also the rapid western need for the Persian Gulf oil, the United States formulated a new set of policies

which became America's new strategic policy. The major aims of this policy were to keep the flow of oil to America and other western nations, and also to protect American allies in the region.

Iran was one of the first areas which attracted American attention because Iran suffered from internal and external problems. Because of the mismanagement and internal corruptions, Iran lived in economic misery. Because of the allies' occupation of that country, Iran lost her independence and security. The Iranian crisis threatened the security and stability of the whole Persian Gulf region.

The United States should take the lead in running the world in the way that the world ought to be run.

Harry S. Truman, 1945

IV. FIRST SHIFT

In the years 1945-1947 the U.S. government was extremely careful in its relationship with Iran. The attention of American policy makers moved toward the Persian Gulf. Washington was beginning to realize the strategic importance of Iran in terms of her location in the region and because of her economic importance with respect to oil. Many American policy-makers understood that if Iran fell to the Soviets, all western economic and political interests in the region would become vulnerable to Soviet influence. Thus, America began to support Iran's desire for independence. It was the beginning of the first shift in American policy. The relationship built because both countries, Iran and the United States, had common interests and common enemies.

Iran's New Importance in American Strategic Policy

Until 1939, Iran was not very important in American strategic policy. The United States had neither significant military and economic interests in Iran, nor were there many Iranian voters compared to those of other ethnic groups, such as the Irish, in the United States. After all, the American government did not like Reza Shah's policy. The situation changed dramatically only after Reza Shah's death in 1944, when Washington began to commit itself to the security of Iran, and hence, gradually replace Britain as a new superpower in the region. While the British position as a leading world power was in decline, the position of the United States as superpower was on the rise.[23]

The Americans were very careful of their involvement in Iran because both the Russians and the British were America's allies. American

diplomats and intelligence agents tended to sympathize with the Iranians and were sometimes critical of the behavior of London and Moscow policy makers.[24] Washington wanted as much information as possible about the Iranian situation.

In 1941, the American Commission of Experts submitted a report to President Roosevelt. In that report, the Commission stated that the center of the world's petroleum output was shifting to the Persian Gulf. At the same time, the American Special Emissary, Mr. Patrick Hurly, after his return from a Middle East visit, advised the President that the United States should support the Shah. Mr. Hurly added that "Washington should help Iran in building a democratic government based upon a system of free enterprise."[25]

Mr. John Jernegan's report was one of the best ever written about Iran at that time. Mr. Jernegan was a State Department Middle East expert. He learned that the only way to avoid further trouble in the region would be to strengthen Iran so it would be able to stand on its own feet, and hold firm against the two European powers. Jernegan added that the "Russian policy had been fundamentally aggressive and the British policy fundamentally defensive in character." He seemed to believe that the result of both the Russian and British policies was the interference in the internal affairs of Iran.[26]

President Roosevelt became interested in Iran. He was looking for some way to help Iran with her economic misery and at the same time stay neutral. The President was looking for long-range American interests. He said, "If we can get the right kind of American experts who will

remain loyal to their ideals, I feel certain that our policy of aiding Iran will succeed."[27]

In December, 1943, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin met in Tehran for a conference of great significance. One of the things discussed at that conference was the Iranian issue. President Roosevelt was pushing the allies for Iranian independence. The conference finally ended with the Tehran Declaration, in which the three great powers promised to preserve Iran's unity and independence. The Declaration was a great victory for Iranians and was the basis for an American obligation to protect Iran and to furnish large-scale aid.[28]

America's practical interests seemed to require a strong Iran, free from internal weakness and dissensions that breed foreign intervention. A weak Iran might provoke conflict between the Soviet Union and Britain or an imperialist partition by the two. It would be far better for Iran to become an example of Allied cooperation in the post-war period. Since the United States was popular among Iranians and had few material interests of its own in that country, the Roosevelt Administration believed America would be the best guardian of Iran's sovereignty as a free nation.

The economic situation of Iran was serious. In 1942, the Iranian government asked America for help. They asked for an American financial mission to bring order into finances and the troubled economic situation. The American government answered positively. They chose Dr. A. C. Millspaugh, who had worked in Iran before, to head the new American economic mission to Iran. Millspaugh arrived in Iran in January, 1947. To give him more room and flexibility, the government of Iran appointed him as Director General of Finance. Millspaugh, along with 70 other

Americans, worked in the Ministries of Treasury, Finances, Food, and Price Stabilization, the national banks and customs. Millspaugh's extensive control over Iranian finance and the economy was clarified by the so-called Full Powers Law. His purview included finance, banking, government industry, commerce, and emergency wartime controls.[29]

Millspaugh's major goal was to introduce a new income tax bill. He thought such a bill would help the government balance its budget. Millspaugh also worked to improve grain collection and government subsidies. Millspaugh saw his mission as a foundation for the future American relationship with Iran. He subsequently wrote, "Our control of revenues and expenditures not only served as a stabilizing influence, but also was indispensible to the full effectiveness of Americans in other fields."[30]

Millspaugh's efforts brought opposition from both conservatives and reformers in Iran. The conservatives saw Millpaugh's programs interfering with their interests. The reformers' objection was Millspaugh's failure to cope with high prices or industrial inefficiency. When Millspaugh tried to fire the head of the National Bank in late 1944, the situation became worse. Finally, the opposition caused the mission to resign, with most of its program having had little effect. There is no doubt, however, that Millspaugh's efforts brought a change in the Iranian economic situation.[31]

The United States sent a small military mission headed by Colonel H. Norman Schwarzkopf to reshape the Gendarmery (borderguards), in Iran. The goal of this mission was to reorganize the internal security force and help the government of Tehran stand on its feet.

The Russians did not like the American attempt to reshape the economy and the security of Iran. They were suspicious about America's real intention in Iran. The oil development in 1944 made the situation more complicated.

Attempting to strengthen America's involvement as a counterweight to occupying powers, the Iranian government, once again, invited American oil companies (Standard Vacuum and Sinclair) to negotiate for possible concessions in the North. Northern Iran was still under Soviet occupation.

The Soviets, too, sent a delegation of their own. The Russians reminded the Iranian government that Moscow had at first offered Finland easy terms, but later, after that country resisted, was forced to accept much less favorable arrangements. Iran should not make a similar mistake.[32]

Moscow demanded an oil concession that would cover all five northern provinces of Iran, stretching from Azerbaijan (northwest) to Khorasan (northeast), under Soviet occupation. The Soviet objective in this demand was to rebuff American and any further British demands for oil concessions, and thereby to undercut the influence of these two powers in Iran. These Russian demands put the Iranian government into deadlock. It was impossible for the Iranian government to accept the Russian demand, yet, it was not possible to refuse it. Iranian government postponed all negotiations for oil concessions until after the war. Both the Americans and the Soviets would have to wait. The creatêr of this law was a Majlis (Parliament) member named Muhammad Mossadeq, who later would lead the fight to nationalize oil in Iran.[33]

The Final confrontation between America and the Soviet Union over Iran was about the Soviet withdrawal from the country. The final date for troop withdrawal, "as agreed at the three powers foreign ministers' conference of September 1945, had been set for March 2, 1946."[34] But as the war neared its end, the Soviet Union continued to strengthen its forces in Northern Iran. This Russian attitude angered the Iranian government, and they found that there was no solution for this situation but to settle it in the United Nations. In January, 1946, the Iranian government, with British and U.S. support, formally charged the Soviet Union before the Security Council under the United Nations Charter with creating "international friction" by interference in Iranian internal affairs.

The dispute over Iran, which so far had been kept at the regional level, finally assumed its place in the arena of global politics. The Soviet Union, in defending its presence in Iran, introduced formal charges against Britain over Greece and Indonesia, and argued that the Security Council is not "capable of handling issues like these." The Russian Communist newspaper, Izvestia, provocatively questioned the legality of the presence of American troops in Iran. It questioned how their presence without a treaty with the Iranian government "tallies with Iran's sovereignty and independence."[35]

The Iranian Crisis contributed to rising American suspicious of Moscow's real intention. The Soviet behavior also influenced American policy. Moscow's action in Iran, as well as neighboring Turkey and Eastern Europe, heightened the United States' suspicions toward Stalin's postwar intentions. W. Averell Harriman, the United States Ambassador

to Moscow was busy analyzing the Russians' real goal. He wrote in January, 1945, that "Moscow's policy seemed to use occupation troops, local communist parties, labor unions, sympathetic leftist organizations and economic pressure to establish regimes outwardly independent, but in practice subservient to the Kremlin."[36]

President Truman, who succeeded Roosevelt, distrusted the Soviets even more than Roosevelt had. For President Truman, the dispute over Iran was no longer regional. He wrote, "Russian activities in Iran threatened the peace of the world." He added that, "If the Russians were to control Iran's oil, either directly or indirectly, the raw material balance of the world would undergo serious damage, and it would be a serious loss for the economy of western world."[37] America's response to the Soviets was the Truman Doctrine, of March, 1946, which was acclaimed by the Iranians as a further demonstration of the American interest in their security.

The American pressure, finally, forced Stalin to withdraw Soviet troops in 1946, leaving the autonomous republics he had sponsored in Kurdistan and Azerbaijan to be crushed by the Shah's troops. Iran's economy continued to be dominated by the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AIOC). During the late forties and early fifties, Iran was convulsed with political agitation for the nationalization of AIOC. The National Front (i.e., liberal and on the whole secular), led the campaign for nationalization. Both the Communist Party (Tudeh) and Islamic activists joined the campaign, but sought, whenever possible, to capture its leadership for themselves. The Shah was caught in the middle, trying to play the various groups against each other and to mediate

between nationalist demands and great-power interests. Iran, which had earlier been seen as a test case for post-war Anglo-American-Soviet cooperation, had now become a decisive battleground in the emerging Cold War.

Imperialism is for us a long cow with its head in the Middle East, where it is being fed, and its udders in Britain, where it is being milked of its oil.

Adil Husain, an Egyptian Nationalist

V. THE SECOND SHIFT

The second shift in U.S. policy toward Iran occurred when the United States started to support Iran publicly. In this shift the Iranian-American relationship crystallized and developed to form the strongest alliance which the U.S. had in the Persian Gulf region.

Although this relationship weakened during the Iranian nationalization of its oil industry, it started to get even stronger after Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadeq was overthrown by a military coup.

During the second shift, the U.S. administration helped the Shah's regime economically and militarily. The U.S., through the American Technical Cooperation, helped the Iranian economy. It was because of this program and Iran's revenue from its oil that Iran started to depend on itself. Iran became a successful example for the Third World countries. The rapid communist expansion in the Middle East and the Arab nationalism movement threatened the Shah's regime. To keep Iran safe from these threats, the U.S. and the Shah started a new program to modernize the Iranian armed forces.

During this shift the Shah succeeded in establishing his absolute rule in Iran by centralizing all powers in his hands.

Mossadeq's Oil Nationalization: A Threat to the Anglo-American Strategic Interest in the Persian Gulf

One of the most fascinating developments in Iranian politics, after the war, was the emergence of Dr. Mohammed Mossadeq to power. Born to a wealthy landlord family in 1881, Mossadeq, like the Shah, had studied in Switzerland. He returned to Iran in 1906 to work as a civil servant in

education and provincial government. More than once he had run afoul of Reza Shah and had been forced out of public life. As an increasingly influential Majlis member during World War II, he developed his concept of "negative equilibrium." The concept simply meant that rather than appease the Great Powers, by granting them equal concessions, Mossadeq would argue that they should be kept in dynamic balance by being kept at arm's length. Mossadeq had also consistently advocated the creation of a parliamentary democratic system with the power of monarchy limited and regulated by law, the exertion of Iran's ownership and control over its resources, particularly oil, and the implementation of rapid, fundamental socio-economic reforms.[38]

By the year 1950, Mossadeq gained increasing support, both inside and outside the Majlis (Parliament), from the newly formed National Front (Jebhe-Melli), which was a loose grouping of diverse elements: the Iran Party, Tudah Party, Neo-Nazi Sumka Party, the Ultranationalist Pan-Iran Party, the religious fanatics of the Duties of Islam, and followers of the Sayyed Abol Qasem Kashani. Mossadeq emerged as a leading spokesman of the Front.[39]

Mossadeq advocated the assertion of Iran's ownership and control of its oil industry. The underlying considerations were to maximize Iran's income from its most viable source of capital and minimize the reasons for both British direct activities and Anglo-Soviet rivalry in Iran. As a result of the latter, Iran's relations would improve with the Soviet Union and would be used as leverage against the British influence in Iran. He wished to harness Iranian resources in order to initiate and implement structural political and socio-economic reforms. The

popularity of Mossadeq's program was greatly assisted because the monopoly of the Iranian oil industry controlled by British Petroleum (BP), which owned the AIOC, had proved to be very costly for Iran.[40]

Iran started its nationalization of oil on March 15, 1951, when the Iranian Majlis voted unanimously to nationalize the oil industry in Iran, i.e., AIOC. The nationalization was confirmed by the Senate five days later. At the same time, Parliament ordered the Shah to appoint Mossadeq as Prime Minister. After his arrival to power, Mossadeq declared AIOC nationalized on May 1, and in return, promised compensation. Mossadeq's design for the nationalization was based on the fact that Iran had the right, as a sovereign independent country, to nationalize its oil industry. He countered this act with concession agreements. Exports of oil halted, the great Abadan refinery shut down, and by October 1951, the last of the British Petroleum employees had sailed for home.[41]

The first Iranian challenge to the oil companies hit British Petroleum interest throughout the Middle East very seriously. Iranian nationalization was more than a confrontation between a company and a country. The British government owned the controlling interest in British Petroleum. The British oil men muttered that Iran could not nationalize British government property--though it had.[42]

British Petroleum boycotted Iranian oil and arranged for all its friends to join the boycott. It then sat back and waited for Dr. Mossadeq to collapse. He did not oblige. Without an ally, without exports, without money, Dr. Mossadeq and Iran held out. Iranian nationalization of its oil became a very important issue in the West. For example, there was Time's lurid portrait of Mossadeq in its January, 1952,

"Man-of-the-Year" story on him:

> In his plaintive, singsong voice he gabbled a defiant challenge that sprang out of a hatred and envy almost incomprehensible to the West. There were millions inside and outside of Iran whom Mossadeq symbolized and spoke for, and whose fanatical state of mind he had helped to create. They would rather see their own nation fall apart than continue their present relations with the West...He is not in any sense pro-Russian, but he intends to stick to his policies even though he knows they might lead to control of Iran by the Kremlin.[43]

In late September, 1951, Great Britain ordered an embargo on Iranian oil and instituted what amounted to an economic blockade of that country. Unable to break the embargo almost universally obeyed by BP's competitors, the Iranian economy, dependent for its health on oil revenues, began to feel the pinch.

For understanding the Iranian Nationalization, it is very useful to look at the summary draft. This draft was adopted by the Iranian Special Oil Committee on April 26, 1951; amended and approved by Majlis on April 30; and promulgated by the Shah on May 2, 1951.[44]

Britain submitted its complaint to the ICJ (International Court of Justice), and took part in negotiations with the Iranian government which ended in a hopeless and deadlocked case. Britain's immediate reaction, after Iran's nationalization of AIOC, was economic warfare--first, by using "gunboat diplomacy" by sending the HMS Maritius into the Persian Gulf, and by reinforcing its troops in Iraq; and second, by putting economic pressure on Iran. For that reason, British Petroleum obtained an agreement with its sister international oil companies not to enter into any agreement with Iran replacing the AIOC. BP and Aramco immediately doubled their production in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iraq.[45]

The economic blockade of Iran produced serious problems for the Mossadeq government. The entire Iranian oil industry came to a virtual standstill, with oil production dropping from 241.4 million barrels in 1950 to 10.6 million in 1952.[46] This action reduced Iran's oil income to almost nil, increased Iran's economic plight, and caused a severe strain on the implementation of Mossadeq's promised reforms. In January of 1953, due to the increasing economic and political difficulties, Mossadeq's coalition began to break up.

If the United Kingdom gave in to Mossadeq, they would not only lose prestige, but would also cripple the BP and the British economy. It would also threaten investments and other interests in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East in the face of growing nationalism.[47]

The Soviet Union took advantage of the situation and supported Mossadeq's nationalization of the western oil industry, and hailed Mossadeq's nationalist stance. Moscow also urged the Tudeh Party (Iranian Communist Party) to support Mossadeq in his efforts. Meanwhile, Tudeh supported Mossadeq publicly. By giving support, Tudeh gained strength, after a decline of influence in the 1940's, through the nationalization period. With a push from Moscow, Tudeh led strikes. These demonstrations helped push Iran toward anti-British and anti-American policies. The general line of Tudeh in this period was to tie in popular nationalist demands and slogans with arguments suggesting that Iran would be better off to sever its ties with the West and rely on Soviet trade and good will.[48]

The British government was looking for "any way" to deal with the Mossadeq government. As has been mentioned, the British government

asked the I.C.J. for judgment in the dispute. The judgment of the International Court of Justice in the case of the United Kingdom v. Iran was rendered on July 22, 1951. The Court, by a vote of nine to five, found that it had no jurisdiction in the case; it also accordingly ruled that its order of provisional measures ceased to be operative.[49]

On September 28, the United Kingdom delegation requested from the Security Council of the United Nations a "complaint of failure by the Iranian government to comply with provisional measures indicated by the I.C.J. in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company Case.[50]

The British, finally, asked the Americans for help in their conflict with Mossadeq. Although the oil conflict was primarily a matter between the British and the Iranians, it involved the United States as well. Officially, the United States proclaimed its neutrality, but realizing that a solution was vital to its own interests, acted unofficially to bring about a settlement of the dispute--at first through mediation. Initially, the United States favored the Iranians and urged the British to make concessions. Soon the intransigence of Dr. Mossadeq and some of his close followers in the government drove the Americans into a united front with the British, against the Iranians.[51]

As the oil negotiations wore on and the United States refused to come to Iran's financial rescue, the Nationalists became increasingly disappointed and bitter, and Iranian-American relations suffered accordingly.

After nationalization, Mossadeq and his followers apparently expected American neutrality. They also thought that the U.S. would give Iran loans to deal with the economic crisis, and that the U.S.

would purchase oil from Iran. Mossadeq was convinced that the American position would not change:

> Mossadeq believed the Americans, who had no stake in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, would support nationalization. This belief was based on America's resentment towards Britain's role in the region and the influence flowing British involvement in AIOC. Mossadeq's misreading of the scene was not entirely his fault as the American Ambassador in Tehran, Henry Grady, encouraged this view. The Americans sided with the British, at first, merely to ensure that the nationalization did work. Then, they feared that the Soviet Union might exploit the situation and thus, the outlawed Tudeh Party would gain ground in Iran. This led them to consider the more drastic solution of overthrowing Mossadeq.[52]

The reason behind the American shift in foreign policy (from neutral to anti-Mossadeq), was the Cold War. The Soviet Union supported the Iranaian action in nationalizing its oil. The Eisenhower Administration, under growing pressures form American global strategy against communism, and as a result of British propaganda (supported by the Iranian conservatives) had been convinced that a reliable alternative to Mossadeq's administration would be a government headed by the anti-communist, pro-Western monarchy. In a dramatic turnabout, Washington hardened its position against Mossadeq. When Mossadeq appealed directly to Eisenhower on May 28, 1953, for American economic assistance to improve its economic pressures which were caused by AIOC and the British government, Eisenhower refused to assist. He said, "It would not be fair to the American taxpayer for the United States government to extend any considerable amount of economic aid to Iran so long as Iran could have access to funds derived from the sale of its oil if a reasonable agreement were reached.[53]

American backing of the British position, produced animosity in Iran toward the United States. The United States aims had generally been thought different from Great Britain's.

The loss of oil revenue, decline in oil-related employment, and deterioration of economic relations with Britain and the United States, continued to strain the Iranian economy. In 1952, the Shah and his foreign advisers wanted Mossadeq out, as did the AIOC and the new British conservative government under Churchill. In late 1952, the Shah dismissed Mossadeq and appointed a new prime minister. The Shah's decision was met by massive demonstrations. The Shah, under pressure of the Iranian people, returned Mossadeq to office again. Mossadeq returned to power with special hatred for the Pahlavi family, especially the Shah's twin sister, Ashraf. In rapid succession, Mossadeq sent Ashraf abroad with retired senior army officers suspected of harboring royalist loyalties, stopped distribution of crown lands on the ground that these possessions were acquired illegally, (and therefore, were not to be treated as part of the royal patronage) and circumscribed the royal Fiat within the Majlis. In mid-1953, the Shah and his wife ran away from Iran to Baghdad and then to Rome.[54]

Mossadeq was faced with the new problem of how to run the oil industry in Iran. Neither Mossadeq nor his advisors had any concept of the problems involved in running a major company. They didn't have the faintest idea of how to sell their oil on international markets without a tanker fleet or distribution system of their own. This situation complicated the oil crisis even more. Mossadeq, also, started having problems with the religious leaders and with the Tudeh. The religious leaders became aware of the threat of communism to the whole Islamic system and to the way of life of the Iranian people. They began to realize the danger of possibly slipping by default into the loss of

independence to the Soviet Union while struggling to be free from Britain.[55]

By the beginning of 1953, there had developed a clear break between the National Front and the Tudeh Party. The Front was expecting the full support of the party at that critical time, yet the party was critical of Mossadeq and the Front for, what it charged as, failure to continue the struggle to its logical conclusion. The problem, which Mossadeq and the National Front faced over Tudeh support, was a critic1 one. The problem was one of mutual support at various critical stages of the large struggle.

To increase public confidence, Mossadeq attempted to control the army, but failed in this attempt, because the army was still loyal to the Shah and influenced by its American advisors. The royalist group was the most effective group within the Army. This group of officers was secretly planning for a military coup. Meeting regularly at the officer's club in Tehran, a group of military commanders retired by Mossadeq decided to form a secret committee. The group was headed by General Fazallah Zahedi. The group then established contact with the British Secret Service, and was financed in the beginning of 1953 by the former AIOC. Moreover, the secret committee further widened its network and established connections with the American official in the American Embassy in Tehran. The military officers finally succeeded in overthrowing Mossadeq on August 19, 1953.[56]

The nature of the American involvement in Mossadeq's overthrow is not clear. In his statement in 1954, Major General George C. Stewart, as a witness in the U.S. Congress, House Committee on Foreign Affairs,

mentioned that the U.S. military mission and MAAG (Military Assistance Advisory Group), played an indirect role in supporting the Iranian Army and the Shah:

> The Shah's government would not be in existence today except for the Iranian Army, and the Iranian Army maintained the ability to hold up its head and stay loyal to its traditional leader only because of the self-respect that it attained through the assistance we had given it.
>
> Now, when this crisis came on and the thing was about to collapse, we violated our normal criteria and among other things we did, we provided the army immediately on an emergency basis the need that permitted and created an atmosphere in which they could support the Shah...if it had not been for this military program in Iran, that country would no longer be on the side of those countries allied with the United States.[57]

General Stewart was the Director of the Office of Military Assistance in the Department of Defense of the United States.

The coup would not have succeeded without significant internal disaffection or indifference within Mossadeq's coalition, but without outside aid, the coup would not have succeeded.

Mohammed Mossadeq was undoubtedly one of the most fascinating and unique personalities in 20th Century politics. Mossadeq was well adapted to the requirements of Iranian politics. To draw in large numbers of Iranians who had never before been politically active, Mossadeq had to emphasize the dramatic. His whole strategy was to embody Iran personally, its problems and its requirements. Mossadeq's defense of Iran's independence, his hate of AIOC, his charisma, and his overthrow by the military with foreign financial support helped make him an enduring national hero. Oppositionists of the most varying views (leftists, liberals, secular and religious groups), invoked his name, cherished his picture, and found appropriate quotations from him to support their views.

Western opinion, often ignorant and condescending toward Iranian political culture, generally failed to understand the very pragmatic nature of Mossadeq's approach to the special flavor of Iranian statecraft. While Mossadeq's personality and political ideology were far from those of Ayatollah Khomeini, both the movements they led and the tactics they employed had a good deal in common. Indeed, Western media descriptions of Mossadeq might be freely interchanged with their portrayals of Khomeini twenty-five years later.

As the Shah returned home, the armed forces proceeded to dismantle the National Front as well as Tudeh. They arrested Mossadeq and executed most of the members of the Mossadeq government and Tudeh Party. The regime could feel confident that it had eliminated the organization, if not the appeal, of both Tudeh and the National Front. The Shah, like his father Reza Shah, could now rule without an organized opposition. History had come full circle.[58]

Mossadeq's nationalist government was replaced by a pro-western, pro-Shah government which was headed by General Zahedi. Also, the Eighteenth Majlis had been elected during Zahedi's term as prime minister. This Majlis was composed largely of pro-Palace landlords, conservative merchants, and deputies who had supported the Shah during his confrontation with Mossadeq. The Shah, by now, had achieved substantial power over parliament and his prime minister.[59]

The Shah had, also, discovered a new source of guidance and support--the United States of America. The Americans now began their support for the Shah's regime openly, which indicated the beginning of the Second Shift in American strategic policy. This new change in American policy

was clear and distinct in Secretary John Foster Dulles' disclosure to the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

> At this time [mid-1953) non-communist forces, encouraged by our aid and friendly interest over the past two years, took measures to ensure that Iran would turn toward the free world--The fact that during the two years, the United States had kept alive the confidence of patriotic Iranian elements in our ability and willingness to help contributed to tipping the balance in favor of loyal non-communist Iranians.[60]

While the British government of the day also opposed Mossadeq's machinations, it was the American support (caused by the rising power of the Tudeh Party in Iran), which was effective in bringing back the Shah.

The most important issue in the Shah's agenda, after the improvement of internal stability, was to find a settlement for the oil conflict between Iran and AIOC, and other oil companies. The Shah turned to his American friend for help and advice about the oil issue. The American administration helped him reach a solution in 1954. Especially important in putting Iran back on its feet was the oil agreement the United States helped negotiate between Tehran and the petroleum corporation, or the consortium. William Forbis, in his Fall of Peacock Throne (1980), said, "It was Herbert Hoover, Jr. who first thought up the idea of a consortium. He was President Eisenhower's adviser on petroleum affairs, and the moment the Shah was safely back on the Peacock Throne, he flew to Tehran to look over the oil situation."[61]

According to this new agreement between Iran and oil companies, two foreign-owned, management-operating companies would carry out the exploration and refining of Iranian oil under a contract with the National Iranian Oil Company (NIOC) and they would sell the product to a new consortium. The oil production was thus divided into the following

proportions: 40 percent for AIOC, 14 percent for Shell Oil, 6 percent to the French Compagnie Francaise des Petroles, and 40 percent to the American oil companies (Exxon, Gulf, Texaco, Mobil and Socal).[62]

Although the 1954 oil settlement solved the oil conflict between Iran and the foreign oil companies, it was certainly a step backward from Mossadeq's design for an all-Iranian oil industry.

The emergence of Mossadeq, the Cold War, and Iran's strategic importance in the Persian Gulf, were the reasons for a new tie between the United States and the Shah of Iran. After Mossadeq's departure from power, and because of mutual interests, the United States started its technical cooperation and arms sales to Iran. It was the beginning of a new shift in the political development between Iran and the United States.

Cold War: The Impact of Soviet-American Confrontation on Iran

The 1940's are known as the beginning of the Cold War era. The Soviet Union and the United States endeavored to impress each other with their military might, technological achievements, economic potential and political principles in order to weaken each other's moral stability and the possibility of domination over Europe and the Third World. According to Hans J. Morgenthau's description of the Cold War in his book Politics Among Nations, the confrontation between the Soviet Union and America has affected the rest of the world as well. Morgenthau said, "They tried to impress their allies, the members of the hostile alliance, and the uncommitted nations with these same qualities." Morgenthau added that the superpower aims were "to keep the allegiance of their own allies, weaken the unity of the hostile coalition, and win the support of the

uncommitted nations."[63] Morgenthau explained that because of these confrontations, the world divided into two power blocs which faced each other like two fighters in a short narrow line. In between these two blocs is the Third World. They can advance and meet in what is likely to be combat, or they can threaten and allow the other side to advance to, what to them, is precious ground.[64]

Since the beginning of the Cold War, the Truman Doctrine has been the base of American foreign policy. With the world situation as it was, the United States soon adopted anti-communism as a national ideology. Armed with this driving force, the United States Government was determined to foil the spread of communism at every turn collectively with other democratic nations, or that failing, unilaterally.[65]

John Spanier in his American Foreign Policy (1983) stated that the Truman Doctrine transformed the U.S. from a position of great weakness and vulnerability into one of relative strength. Spanier said, "The Truman Doctrine had prevented a Soviet breakthough into southeast Europe and the Middle East and established Western Europe's flank in the eastern Mediterranean."[66] The Eisenhower Doctrine, on the other hand, had drawn a clear line between American and Soviet spheres of influence. President Eisenhower in his book, The White House Years: Waging Peace (1965), referring to American post-war foreign policy, wrote;

> The United States lost no foot of the free world to communist aggression, made certain that the Soviet Union and China understood the adequacy of our military power, and dealt with them firmly, but not arrogantly. We regarded our friends as respected partners and valued partners and tried always to create mutual confidence and trust, well knowing that without these ingredients alliances would be of little enduring value.[67]

One of the reasons behind the Eisenhower Doctrine was the collapse of the nationalist government in China. Expansion of communism throughout Asia and the creation of the communist government in China had weakened the Western position in Asia, which shifted the balance of power in the East against the United States. The Russian's attention, meanwhile, turned to the Far East and the Middle East.[68]

The Middle East was the most important part of the Third World because of its oil and its location between Europe, Africa, and Asia. For Britain, this area--and especially the Suez Canal--had traditionally been the lifeline of its old empire and of its present Commonwealth. Above all, Europe's economy was becoming increasingly dependent upon Middle Eastern oil. Without oil, Europe would collapse. The power that could deny it this oil would be able to dictate its future. Soviet influence in the Arab world might thus allow Moscow to neutralize Europe without firing a shot. In short, for the Soviet Union, the Middle East was the means to outflank and disintegrate NATO.[69]

Middle Eastern instability, following the Suez crisis of November, 1956, drew American attention. President Eisenhower, on January 15, 1957, requested that Congress sponsor a joint resolution which would offer economic aid to the Middle Eastern nations desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence. To guarantee the integrity of such nations, the resolution added that "if the President determines that the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed force to assist any of such nations against armed aggression from any country controlled by

international communism."[70] A good example of this new American commitment to defend the Middle Eastern nations was Iran:

> The Government of [Iran] is determined to resist agression. In case of aggression against [Iran] the government of the United States of America, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States of America, will take appropriate action, including the use and arm force, as may be mutually agreed upon and as envisaged in the Joint Resolution to Promote Peace and Stability in the Middle East, in order to assist the Government of [Iran] at its request.[71]

Under the impulse of Cold War politics and American global opposition to communism, Washington had expressed its willingness, prior to the overthrow of Mossadeq, for an alliance with Iran as a member of a regional pact. In February, 1953, President Eisenhower professed a definite need for a U.S. sponsored "system of alliance" in the Iranian region against what he called the enemies [communist] who are plotting our destruction. His Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, subsequently envisaged the concept of the "Northern Tier" alliance, comprising Turkey, Pakistan and Iran. He believed that these countries were aware of their common enemy, communism, and that they could not only defend themselves with American support, but also could prevent the spread of communism throughout the entire Middle East in general, and the Persian Gulf in particular.[72]

The reason behind American concern about this area was the emergence of the Persian Gulf as a major focus of international rivalry. The British withdrawal from the area raised the issue of the security and stability of the Gulf. The communist penetration throughout the region worked as a recipe for the Cold War.

The Russians seemed to be seeking domination over the Gulf because of it's growing importance as chief supplier of oil to the energy-thirsty industrial West and Japan. A number of studies on the Soviet role in the

Middle East showed that in 1940 the Soviet government officially declared its territorial aspirations to be south of national territory of the Soviet Union, in the direction of the Indian Ocean. This general statement was subsequently refined by Foreign Commisar V. Molotov's communication to the German ambassador to Moscow. The statement read, "The area south of Batum and Baku [Iran] in the general direction of the Persian Gulf is recognized as the center of the aspirations of the Soviet Union."[73]

The expressions of striving for southward expansion were regarded as indications of long-range interests of the Soviet Union in the fifties and sixties. The final goal of such a Soviet policy would be to dominate the Gulf region either directly or through the instrumentality of client and satellite-local regimes. The Soviet viewpoint was that the "vacuum" left in the Gulf, by the British withdrawal, was not allowed to exist for long. It would soon be filled by the "agressive" presence of the United States--a country bent on domination of local states and greedy exploitation of their resources through its oil monopolies. Therefore, Moscow engaged in relentless activity to reduce American influence in the Gulf, especially in Iran.[74] To do that, the Russians concentrated on the conflict between the Persians and Arabs over the Gulf, supported the Arab nationalism movement in the region, and discredited the role of the United States by creating anti-American propaganda.

The Gulf area witnessed momentous changes in the 1960s. The source of these changes came from the continuance of communist expansion in the area, such as, the conclusion of Soviet-Iraq Treaty of Friendship and Soviet assistance to Iraqi oil resources, the downfall of South Yemen

and the growing of Soviet and satellite influence in that country, the Soviet support for the Dhofar rebellion on Oman and the Iranian intervention, and the Soviet support for the Arabs' claim over the Gulf's Islands.[75]

The geographical complexity of the Persian Gulf is another source of these conflicts between the Arabs and Iran in which the Soviets took the Arab side. The Persian Gulf has some unique features. Some 500 miles long, and with a width varying from 180 miles to 21 miles, the Gulf has many features which make it a hatching ground for political conflict. There is no other marine body of comparable size in the world surrounded by so many different political units. Coastlines vary from fewer than 20 miles--for Iraq and some of the emirates--to 635 miles for Iran. With great disparity in endowment of coastlines, and with so many independent entities presenting claims to the offshore seabed, the stage is set for conflict.[76]

There are two physical characteristics which greatly increase the potential for offshore conflict. First is the shallowness of the Gulf. Only in the Strait of Hormuz is the Gulf as deep as 100 meters, and its average depth is less than 40 meters. Thus, all of the seabed is geographically a continental shelf and subject to claim. Moreover, most of the Gulf's oil is easily exploitable. Second, there is a complex asymmetrical coastal configuration. The Arabian peninsula is a giant tilted block, inclining very gradulaly from southwest to northeast. The general result is that the Gulf is especially shallow along the western shores. At low tide, there are certain stretches of over 20 miles offshore that are completely uncovered, and there are numerous small islands. On the

Iranian side, however, there is a steeper descent to the sea floor, and relatively few islands. It is from the Gulf's geographical complexity, political and physical, that most Arab-Iranian problems originated.[77]

After his emergence to power, President Gamal Abel Nasser, started his Arab-Nationalism (or Pan-Arabism) movement. Nasser's Pan-Arabism movement, centering in Cairo, warred on the governments of the individual Arab states with the goal of creating a greater Arab unity. The emergence of Nasser in the Middle East was a golden opportunity for the Soviet Union. Moscow expressed its total support for Nasser's attempt to unite the Arabs. By supporting Nasser, the Soviet Union could align itself with Arab Nationalism. Nasser did not regard the METO (Middle East Treaty Organization) merely as a means of containing the Soviet Union; he saw it as an instrument to preserve Western domination throughout the area. Thus, by having the Soviets on his side, he set out to destroy the Baghdad Pact by forming counter alliances and by undermining pro-Western Arab governments.[78]

Behind these developments remained all the essential problems that had given rise to the turmoil after 1955: the conflicts among the Arab States, the Arab-Israeli quarrel, the overshadowing competition between the United States and the Soviet Union, and, above all, Arab nationalism and its movement throughout the Middle East.

The Shah was monitoring these developments with extreme care. The explosion of coups, revolutions, wars, and civil strife, which marked Arab politics of the 1950s and 1960s, naturally made the Iranian leaders nervous. For the Shah, such disquieting events included Nasser's rise to Arab leadership, Egypt and Syria's alliance with the Soviet

Union, Nasserist attempts to overthrow Jordan's King Hussein, and the 1958 civil war in Lebanon.

The Middle East reverberated with the sounds of crashing thrones. In July, 1958, there was a military coup in the neighboring country of Iraq, where the Hashemite royal family was massacred and pro-Moscow General Abud Karem Kassim's regime installed. The Iraqi military coup resulted in an alliance with the Russians. Secret Soviet arm shipments to Baghdad, in the following months, doubled Iraq's armed forces.[79]

Moscow, also, launched another campaign to entice Iran out of the Baghdad Pact, offering in exchange, a long-term nonagression pact. At the same time, the Soviets pressured the Iranian government into cooperation. Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev told Iranian Ambassador Msud Ansari, in the autumn of 1959, that the neutral Iran could obtain "ten times" as much American aid, as well as Soviet assistance. Khrushchev added, "unless the Iranians changed their ways, Moscow might invoke a forty-year-old treaty with Iran [repeatedly disclaimed by Tehran] permitting Soviet military action against foreign bases on Iranian soil."[80]

By the beginning of the 1960s, Iran was still the central issue of the Cold War in the region. Egypt broke her diplomatic relations with Iran in 1960 because Tehran continued its diplomatic ties with Israel. Arab nationalists launched all-out propaganda attacks against Iran. Persian settlers in the Arab countries and especially in sheikdoms of the Gulf were denounced as part of a plot to steal these lands from the Arabs. Syria, Iraq and other Arab states supported a "liberation movement" claiming Iran's oil rich southwestern province of Khuzistan [which they called Arabistan] for the Arab world.

The Soviets used the power of media against the United States and her allies in the Persian Gulf. The major focus of the Russian controlled media was the United States policies and behavior in the broader Gulf area. The Soviet propaganda described America as an imperialist country bent on establishing its hegemony over the region...as an ally of Zionism and local reactionary forces. The Soviets media characterized the United States as a state continuously interfering with the internal affairs of the local country through the CIA, "in spying and hatching plots of alliance with the Iranian SAVAK and Israeli intelligence."[81]

The major aim of the Russian media was the Gulf nations, because the masses in these countries remained very poor and suffered from illiteracy. Thus, they became a good market for the Russian media.

With the regional situation becoming more and more frightening, quick American support was necessary. The American leaders' genuine concern over these external threats to Iran was fully matched by their continued belief that internal problems such as Soviet occupation of northern Iran and Mossadeq's nationalization of the oil industry posed the major danger to the country's stability. It was for these reasons, and also because of the Shah's desire to improve the Iranian armed forces, that the United States started her arms sales to Iran. Iran became highly important in American strategic policy in the Persian Gulf region.[82] But before discussing the arms sales, it is necessary to examine the U.S. technical cooperation program, begun during the Cold War Era, which put special emphasis on Iran.

American Technical Cooperation

In 1949, the United States adopted the Point Four Plan (a term continuing technical and economic cooperation in needy countries). The United States under the Truman Administration was expected to invest billions of dollars in Latin America, Asia, and Africa in order to help the people in those areas achieve a self-sustaining rate of economic growth, to develop their natural resources, and to aid in transforming backward societies into modern, urbanized, industrial nations.

Iran is a good example of those underdeveloped areas. The United States started to pay special attention to Iran after World War II. American strategic policy gradually discovered that Iran should be strengthened to the point where it could be master of its own house, and thus, be in a good position to take care of its own defense. A weak and vulnerable Iran would only invite disorder and "predatory strength" which would give rise to trouble. To have a clear picture of this part of the American strategic policy, it would be useful first to define the Point Four Program, and second to discuss it in terms of the Iranian case.

What was the Point Four Program?

Point Four was the term applied to the continuing technical cooperation program of the United States from 1950 through 1965. President Truman announced that the United States would extend technical assistance, designed to help free people in the world to help themselves by producing more food and clothing, and by improving their standard of living. This was to be one of four major pillars of the United States foreign policy.

Its objectives were in line with the aspiration of men everywhere for improved agriculture, more education and better health.

On January 20, 1949, President Harry S Truman announced the plans as follows:

> First, we will continue to give unfaltering support to the United Nations and related agencies, and we will continue to search for ways to strengthen their authority and increase their effectiveness.
>
> Second, we will continue our program for world economic recovery.
>
> Third, we will strengthen freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggression...
>
> Fourth, we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial prograss available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.[83]

More than half the people in the world are living in conditions approaching misery, the President said. Their food is inadequate, they are victims of disease, and their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas.

The President added that for the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people. The President stated that, "Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, help them through their own efforts, to produce more food, clothing, materials for housing and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens."[84]

This plan should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies wherever practicable. Guarantees to investors must be balanced by guarantees in the interest of the people whose resources and labor go into these developments.

President Truman added that all countries, "including our own," will greatly benefit from a constructive program for better use of the world's human and natural resources.

The situation in Europe started to improve after the Marshall Plan. The result of American help to Europe was very impressive. The situation was, of course, very different in underdeveloped countries from that in Western Europe. In Europe, in 1947, the preconditions of economic recovery were already present. The people were healthy, enterprising, literate and skilled. Government civil services were well-established and well-staffed. Public services were highly developed, though disrupted by war. The missing components--food, raw materials, replacement machinery--could easily be brought in from abroad. In the Third World, there was a need to start everything from square one.

One important reason behind the American adoption of this plan was communist expansion throughout the Third World. Mr. Samuel P. Hayes, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, commented about this matter. He said that the expansionist drive of communist imperialism and the potential destructiveness that another war would characterize, would force us to seek, not a balance, but more likely a preponderance of power between what we think of as the free world and the captive Soviet world.

Hayes expressed the intention of the American administration even more clearly when he said that the administration cannot expect to entrust American security for even a possible preponderance of power, "we cannot confine ourselves to dealing with symptoms. We must go much deeper and try to root out the germ..."[85]

What was the Purpose of the Point Four Plan?

Besides humanitarian reasons for helping the people in Asia, Africa and Latin America, there were good political and economic reasons. The political reason was that these very areas were ideal breeding grounds for communist agitation.

Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson made this point very clear when he gave his report before the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations (1949). He mentioned that increasing numbers of people in underdeveloped areas no longer accept poverty as an inevitable fact of life. They are becoming aware of the gap between their living standards and those in more highly developed countries. They are looking for a way out of their misery. They are not concerned with abstract ideas of democracy or communism. They are interested in practical solutions for their problems in terms of food, shelter and decent livelihood. When the communists offer quick and easy remedies for all their ills, they make a strong appeal to these people.[86]

The economic reason for the Point Four Program was America's need for the underdeveloped areas to produce raw materials, with a market to sell the goods. America, with all its wealth of natural resources, was still a long way from being a self-sufficient nation. After World War II, America had become even more dependent on the oil from the Middle East and from Venezuela.

Economic development would not just bring America certain practical material benefits, new sources of materials and goods which it needed, and new markets for the products of American farms and factories, but it would also help America's friends in Europe, too. These friends, who

depend far more than America does on foreign goods and markets, would benefit in similar ways. Mr. Francis H. Russell, the Director of the Office of Public Affairs, Department of State, pointed out the importance of the Third World to Europe. He stated that if America relies on foreign sources for some supplies, then Europe must depend on them for the essentials of life itself. He added that Europe cannot contemplate a prosperous future without continually expanding markets and new sources of imports. He accepted that the Point Four Program benefited America more than the Third World, "We have more to gain by what we put into these underdeveloped areas than from what we get out of them,"[87] said Russell.

Point Four Plan and the Iranian Case

America started small economic assistance to Iran during and after World War II. The nationalization of Iranian oil stopped the American Technical Cooperation to Iran, for a while.

With the downfall of the Mossadeq government, and the new pro-American government in Iran, the American cooperation program continued. An important characteristic of this period was the drastic increase of American aid to Iran. Under its various programs and agencies, including A.I.D. and the Export-Import Bank, the United States provided the Iranian regime, from 1953 to 1957 alone, with a total of $366.8 million in economic-financial aid, $250.6 million which was in the form of a grant-in-aid and $116.2 million from a loan. The inflow of such aid continued at an average of $45 million a year from the next three years. In 1961, a time when the Iranian economy had failed to make substantial progress, Washington increased its aid to $107.2 million: $35 million as a grant, and $72.2 million as a loan.[88]

This increased aid, supplementing Iran's oil income, enabled the Shah's regime not only to meet the need of its empty treasury, and its administrative and welfare expenditures, but also to ensure the implementation of the remaining projects of the First Seven Years Development Plan (1949-1956). This plan had been stalled during the nationalization crisis and the entire program of the Second Development Plan (1956-1962).

Along with the inflow of American aid to Iran came a large body of U.S. official advisors and technical experts, employees of aid agencies and technicians from commercial organizations, and private investors. They were to assist the Iranian government in its economic planning and allocation of American aid, provide technical know-how, and establish joint ventures with both the Iranian government and entrepreneurs, who were now once again confident that Iran was firmly set in developing a free enterprise system. In the late 1950s there were more than 900 American economic and technical experts active in various fields in Iran. They helped in drafting and implementing Iran's Second Development Plan, which stressed the essential role of both public and private sectors in Iranian economic development and called for increasing foreign investment. At this time, the government had promulgated the law for the attraction and protection of foreign investment in 1955. The main object of this law was to encourage foreign participation in economic development, (particularly in the industrial sector), safeguard the interest of foreign firms (mainly against confiscation), and upgrade foreign investors to an equal status with private domestic investors.[89]

The American investors played a major role in stimulating the banking system and, most importantly, in creating the Industrial and

Mining Development Bank of Iran in 1959. Following its establishment, the Bank was very important in promoting private industry and providing financial, technical and advisory assistance to private investors. During the second half of the 1950s, private investments more than tripled and the import of capital goods increased sixfold.[90]

A number of key economic projects went to American firms, as an extension of the fact that they were financed largely by U.S. aid and investment. Other foreign firms, which either helped the American firms (or were commissioned by them), or entered private contracts with Iran, were mainly West German, French and British. By the early 1960s, U.S. direct private investments in Iran were estimated to be in excess of $200 million.[91]

At the same time, the United States was Iran's leading partner, with the balance of trade well in their favor. In 1963, for example, Iran's imports from the United States amounted to $103.7 million and its exports to the U.S. reached $40.4 million.[92] This rapid entrenchment of the American position in Iranian economic planning and operations was reinforced by American administrations.

The Result of the American Assistance to Iran

After Mossadeq's overthrow and the return of the Shah back to the power in Iran, the U.S. government concentrated on assisting the Iranian regime by economic, military, and political means. Stempel analyzed the reason of this new American support of the Shah was because the Eisenhower Administration favored the Shah. Stempel added, "Since the Shah approved of Western initiatives in the Middle East, Iran joined the Baghdad Pact, a British-sponsored security alliance against the threat of communism, in

November, 1955."[93] Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, remembering the instability of the Mossadeq era, had to be talked into the idea. The U.S. became much more positive toward a potential regional role for Iran after the Suez crisis in 1956, and increased its economic and military aid to countries in the region, including Iran. Iraq withdrew from the Baghdad Pact in March, 1959, after the revolution of 1958, and began receiving military equipment from the Soviets immediately. Concerned about the aftershocks of the Iraqi revolution, Washington signed a mutual cooperation agreement with Iran which committed the United States to come to its aid if the country were attacked.

The result of this American Technical Cooperation in Iran was extensive. American involvement in Iran brought with it a great increase in western social and cultural influence, particularly among those educated urban Iranians who found the Shah's regime and its pro-western stance desirable and beneficial. This influence consolidated the overall structure of Iran's dependence on, and vulnerabiltiy to, the United States. Iran's socio-economic development and foreign policy objectives became closely tied to the interests of the capitalist world.[94]

Iran's internal problems in the 1950s and 1960s were similar to those that would crop up a decade later. Inflation and mismanagement were out of control. Economic expansion had greatly increased the opportunities for corruption, causing soaring land values, high rents, and food shortages. The crippled, yet rapid development led to the need to redress the imbalance and, like other Third World countries, Iran sought more money from abroad--rather than retrenchment at home--as the way out.[95]

The Shah expected a swift domestic consolidation of his rule from Iran's dependence on the United States and alliance with the West. In this respect, his efforts were indeed rewarding to some extent. By the end of the 1950s, he had succeeded in establishing his rule almost throughout Iran, and was surviving strong opposition internally as well as externally.

After improving Iran's economy, the Shah's new taks was the military. He started the biggest military buildup in Iran's modern history.

American Arms to the Shah

America's support for Iran developed very rapidly during the Eisenhower Administration. Most of the American assistance was of the military or economic type. President Eisenhower approved the provision of $45 million in economic aid. The amount of American military assistance increased after Mossadeq's removal and the return of the Shah. For instance, between 1949 and 1952, the United States granted Iran $33 million in military aid; but between 1953 and 1957, the number rose to $500 million which was directed to the Shah's armed forces.[96] The Shah and his military men were obviously benefiting from American help, both through improved morale and through promises of enhanced combat efficiency. At the same time, the American support would accord Iran greater weight in its search for an expanded role in the Persian Gulf and adjacent regions.

After the improvement of the economic situation in Iran, the second track of American policy concentrated on the Iranian armed forces. In a sense, the Iranian military was to serve as a "safety net" for the palace if it were to be threatened again. The Americans may

have concluded that the Iranian military, properly armed, trained and indoctrinated, could act as a stabilizing force with or without a monarchy. As Robert Pranger and Dale Tahtinen noted, the Iranian military became the object of a major campaign. They said, "In fiscal years 1953 through 1961 our total military assistance to Iran was about half the assistance we gave all countries in the 1953-1969 period, and all of it was in the form of outright grants."[97]

American military assistance deeply affected the modernization of Iranian armed forces. Many Iranian military officers were trained at academies and schools in the United States and Europe. More than 25,000 Iranian officers and enlisted men learned English, familiarized themselves with modern American military equipment, absorbed American military doctrine, strategy and tactics, and in the process became familiar with American institutions and principles of government.

The overthrow of the Mossadeq government by a military coup in August 1953, changed Iran's postwar situation in many ways. These changes remained important for a quarter century of ensuing dictatorial rule. The United States, which in the early postwar period had an uneasy partnership with Britain in influencing Iran, now became the dominant foreign power in Iran. This dominance was reflected by the United States taking a 40 percent share in the oil consortium in 1954--the same large minority percentage that was held by the AIOC before Mossadeq's nationalization. These American-Iranian oil developments were accompanied by growing military supplies, advisers, civilian and governmental programs.[98]

By the late 1950s, the Shah had consolidated his control over much of the country, especially over the intelligentsia and the urban working class. Provincial governors used the gendarmerie and the town police to tightly supervise parliamentary elections and thus, control both the Majlis and the Senate.[99] In the meantime, the Shah showed a growing interest in modernizing Iran's economy and society, in making the country Western in character and, especially, in making it militarily strong. Western governments and corporations felt safer with a centralized government under a pro-Western ruler. A pro-Western ruler would not allow into power a regime, such as Mossadeq's, that might threaten economic and political relations with the West.[100]

The American administrations, in the 1950s and 1960s, were distressed over growing radical forces in the Middle East. The Middle East contained nearly two-thirds of the world's known oil reserves, and the Persian Gulf region accounted for almost one half of that total.[101] The U.S. government was deeply concerned over the possible consequences coinciding with the British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf. Their concern included a "domino theory" involving the overthrow of the weak Sheikdoms by radical Arab revolutionary forces. These were the reasons that the American-Iranian relationship grew rapidly and that the American stake in maintaining harmonious relations with Iran was so great.

The Egyptian president, Nasser, played an important role in the politics of the Middle East throughout the Cold War era. The emergence of Nasser in the Middle East was also a reason behind the rapid Iranian military buildup.

The British government announced in 1968 its intention to withdraw virtually all its forces based east of Suez by 1971. This decision threatened to change the military balance in the Gulf. The Shah was convinced that the British withdrawal was his golden opportunity to be the dominant power in the Gulf.[102]

The Shah was uneasy about a growing influence of Pan-Arabism and Arab republicanism from the stimulus of President Nasser, and a large-scale Egyptian involvement in Yemen sharpened his fears of future Egyptian encroachment into the Persian Gulf area. Between 1964 and 1971, Cairo replaced Moscow as the center of danger in the Shah's eyes--an immediate danger because it was seen as a threat to Iran's economic life line, the oil trade. The Shah feared that if hostile forces gained control of the Persian Gulf states, they would cut the outward flow of Iranian oil, and that might harm his regime. Therefore, the Shah started to build up his army, navy, and air force for an operation in the Persian Gulf to guard Iran's oil installations.

The Shah determined that a full-scale program for modernizing equipment was required for his regime. This program entailed replacement of F-86 aircraft with F-5s and F-4s, to be followed by F-14s. On the ground side, the M-47 tank was to be superseded by (upgraded) M-98s, M-60s, the British Chieftain and other hardware. The naval component was to dispense with the World War II-class frigate and coastal craft in favor of Spruance Class destroyers and related ships, all intended to transform the Imperial Navy into a "blue ocean" force as rapidly as possible. In 1966 the Shah improved his collection of military hardware by adding British Hovercraft which provided Iran with

the world's first fully operational Hovercraft squadron. The Shah completed the arms sale by adding Italian Sea Killer MK2 ship-to-ship missiles where needed for Iranian destroyers.[103]

Because of the Vietnam War, the U.S. balance of payment situation worsened. At the same time, Iran's increasing oil revenues, based on rising production, meant that the Shah had money to pay for military hardware. Iran's oil production rose from 1.6 million barrels per day, in 1965, to 3.0 million in 1967. This number increased to 3.8 million in 1971. Explaining the increase in American sales to Iran, John Stempel in his Inside the Iranian Revolution (1981) said, "Except for a low period in 1971, the percentage of military sales for cash and credit steadily increased. The U.S. actually had begun to push arms sales much earlier, in 1966 and 1967, when President Johnson pressed corporations like McDonnel Douglas and Boeing to sell more."[104] This corporation worked in tandem with the Pentagon, which sought to improve the U.S. balance of payments through such purchases to Iran.

The reason behind the American arms sale was because of the importance of Iran in American military planning in the late 1960s. It was conceived as a "free world" bastion in an otherwise turbulent region of the world, one that might conceivably play a stabilizing role not only in the Persian Gulf region but on the sea beyond. The Shah was encouraged by American officials to contemplate just such a role for himself and his nation in the period after the 1970s. This encouragement also meant that the United States could count on continuing access to important radar stations in northern Iran from which Soviet strategic weapons programs could be monitored. Actually, in 1971, the United

States built two radar centers in the Caspian Sea to monitor the Soviet military and strategic movements.

Strategic moves, designed to strengthen the Shah's hand in the Persian Gulf, had preceded the emergence of Arab republicanism, and were continued vigorously throughout the 1960s and 1970s. After the second military coup in Iraq (the emergence of Ba'ath Party to power) in 1963, the Shah relocated Iran's oil export facilities from the vulnerable river-locked city of Abadan on the Iraqi-claimed Shat-al-Arab River, to Kharg (or Khark) Island in the Persian Gulf. In 1972, he moved the Khoramshah Naval Base, also on the Shat-al-Arab, to Bander Abbas, an Iranian coastal town near the Strait of Hormuz. In early 1970, Iranian forces occupied two strategically important islands situated at the mouth of the Persian Gulf--the Tunb and Abu Masa. The Iranian occupation of these islands sparked violent anti-Iranian demonstrations in radical Arab countries such as Iraq and Libya.[105]

The Shah's strategic moves came along with diplomatic moves. The Shah sought improved diplomatic and commercial relations with the small countries scattered along the Persian Gulf shore. He was among the first to recognize Kuwaiti independence in 1961. He cultivated good relations with the Saudis, who became frequent visitors to Tehran. At the same time, Saudi Arabia and Iran cooperated fully in establishing the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). In 1979, the Shah renounced Iran's long-standing claim to Bahrain and suggested a Bahraini referendum to determine the Island's future. Of course, Bahrain chose independence, which the Shah fully supported.

In 1972, the Iranian Imperial Army, by order from the Shah, became involved in Oman. The Iranian involvement started when the sultan of Oman sought Iranian assistance in suppressing the Dhofari rebels when they began operating along Oman's border with South Yemen. The Shah's action in Dhofar faced protests from Iraq and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. These two Arab countries were the only two Arab states in the region who still maintained a degree of ideological hostility toward the Shah. They protested against the presence of Persian troops on Arab soil.[106]

The Soviet Union was nervous about the Shah's military buildup. The Soviets used their propaganda weapon against the United States and her allies in the Gulf region such as Iran and Saudi Arabia. The Soviet media decried the weapon transactions as a part of political strategy to ensure American control of the oil-rich region. Similar complaints were voiced with regard to the United States shipments of arms to Somalia after the latter's desertion from the Soviet camp.

Moreover, according to Soviet commentaries, arms sales had another nefarious aspect: they were designed to siphon off petro-dollars from the oil-producing states. Instead of serving the needs of local economic development, Russian sources claimed the money generated by oil was being cynically diverted to enrich the imperialist weapon producers.[107]

Of course, Moscow did not mention anything about their involvement in Ethiopia, Yemen and Iraq. During the time of the Iranian military buildup, the Soviet Union started its weapon transactions with Iraq--Iran's traditional enemy.

Iraq's military power was about 250,000 men. Since the early 1970s, the Iraqi government, using oil revenues (which before 1980 were about $30 billion), spent $8 to $9 billion on military hardware, most of it purchased from the Soviet Union. The shipping list included more than 330 Mig, Sukhai, Tupolev, Supersonic Soviet "Backfire," fighters and bombers, along with tanks such as the standard T-54 to T-72, which is considered one of the world's best. Iraq also turned to France to get military hardware. At this time (1973-1978), French arms sales to Iraq amounted to $2.2 billion. France's sales to Iraq included 24 Mirage F1. Iraq also had an option on France's most sophisticated airplane, the Mirage 2000.[108]

The relationship between Iran and Iraq was complicated even more in 1968, when Hasan al-Bakr headed the Ba'ath Party in Iraq. The Shah perceived Hasan al-Bakr's new position as a major change in the regional status quo and as a threat to Iranian security and stability. The Ba'ath government's attempt to exploit the differences between Iraq and Iran for domestic purposes reinforced the Shah's perception. As a result, the Shah stepped up his financial and military support for the Kurdish secessionist movement in Iraq, and Ba'ath increased its support for the anti-Shah groups. This situation led to open conflict between the two sides. These conflicts, among other things, developed into a total war between the two countries after the fall of the Shah.[109]

The Shah's problems were increased by the instability of the area from southeastern to southwestern Iran. The region included the border of Afghanistan and Pakistan, and particularly, the area around the Persian Gulf. Over the years, there were a number of developments

(such as Baluchi independent movement) in this region that the Shah perceived as threatening to Iran.

The Shah worried about tribal problems which were caused by the Baluchi independence movement on the border between Iran and Pakistan. This movement was supported by the Soviet Union and India. Moscow's support of Bangladesh and India in their 1971 war with Pakistan has been interpreted by the Shah's regime as evidence of Soviet expansionist ambitions, focused, in particular, on the Indian Ocean. The Shah was actively worried about the Soviet pincers movement to surround Iran by Soviet friendship treaties with India (1971) and Iraq (1972), and suspected Soviet support for the 1973 coup that deposed the Afghan monarch, King Mohammad Zahir Shah.[110]

The situation in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean convinced the Shah, to buy more weapons. The Shah needed only to convince Washington to sell more weapons. The Shah moved boldly and swiftly to take advantage of the oil crisis in the 1970s. In January 1971, an OPEC conference was convened in Tehran. In that conference, the Shah seized the initiative in proposing a significant rise in the price of oil. The initiative was welcomed by attending Arab states whose major aims were to use OPEC as an instrument in their campaign against Israel. Despite its ties to Israel, Iran would support the Arab cause if Washington failed to meet the Shah's military needs.[111]

In the years 1972-73, Nixon and Kissinger agreed for the first time in the long history of postwar American-Iranian relations to sell Iran virtually any conventional weapons it wanted. The reason for this new American commitment was the 1973 Arab oil embargo. The eruption of the

fourth round of Arab-Israeli hostilities, in October, 1973, caused an Arab embargo on the sale of oil to western supporters of Israel.

The Arabs united for the first time in the 20th Century. Their purpose was to use the oil as a political weapon to pressure Israel allies. Not only did President Nixon support the helping of Israel, but so did the Congress and most of American public opinion. Besides the United States, the Arab oil embargo included the Netherlands and some other European countries who were regarded as too sympathetic to Israel.[112]

The Arab oil embargo did not have a major impact on the U.S., but it was extremely serious on Europe and Japan. Lacking domestic sources, by 1973 Japan had come to import over 99 percent of the crude oil it consumed. About 40 percent of this amount came from OPEC.[113] The embargo convinced the Americans, more than ever, that they could not depend on Arab oil forever.

Because of the embargo, the connection with Tehran assumed even greater priority. Washington was now badly in need of Middle Eastern friends and allies. The Shah had cooperated with the United States by abstaining from the embargo. He proved to the American administration that he was the "only" friend which America could depend on. Hence, Iran became the balance wheel in the region, the leverage state which would influence attitudes and policies of neighboring governments.[114]

Washington wished to maintain a strong military presence in the Gulf region. It seemed that there were only two ways to accomplish this: either by projecting American military power into the area, or by finding a strong ally capable of playing a strong military role. The first

option was almost impossible to execute under prevailing domestic political conditions. The second, by contrast, was readily available, since it met the requirements of the Shah as well as the Nixon Administration. These requirements were not only military, but also economic and strategic.

The friendship between President Nixon and the Shah of Iran started during the Eisenhower Administration. That friendship was strengthened by the Shah's October, 1969, visit to Washington, and especially by Nixon and Kissinger's visit to Tehran in 1972. The result of the Shah's successful negotiation with President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger would be a substantially increased program of military sales to Iran. These sales involved the most advanced equipment produced by American arms manufacturers.[115]

Because of OPEC's price increase in 1973 and the Nixon-Kissinger support, the Shah could afford to buy almost anything. The Shah now became the strongest regional power in the area. As Barry Rubin said, "Iran's transormation into a regionally dominant power was made possible by the 1969 Nixon Doctrine and by certain May, 1972, promises to supply the Shah the necessary weapons."[116]

The growth of U.S. military sales to Iran accelerated sharply from 1973 on. According to a 1976 report by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the United States sold more arms to Iran than any other country. The total military sales to Iran in 1973 was $524 million. The numbers in the following years were $3.91 billion in 1974, $2.6 billion in 1975 and $1.3 billion in 1976.[117]

Most of these military purchases to Iran were under direct supervision of the United States Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG). The function of MAAG was to advise and assist the Iranian minister of war, and other Iranian officials, in matters concerning plans, organization, administration and training.[118]

The Shah took all important decisions into his own hands, including the planning of future purchases. The Shah's attention was focused more towards military issues than toward economic or social and domestic problems. In 1957 he established a new secret police called Sazmani Ittila 'at va Amniyat-i Keshvar (or National Security and Information Organization). It became a notorious organization known as SAVAK. From the beginning of SAVAK, the CIA and Mossad (the Israel Intelligence Service) helped and assisted it. Explaining SAVAK's creation, Stempel said that for 15 years after its creation in 1957, SAVAK worked closely with the CIA and Israel's Mossad, two organizations which helped set it up. The reason for the American intelligence cooperation was, once again, because of the communist threat. Stempel added that, "Liaison work between SAVAK and the CIA continued until the overthrow of the Shah, because it was helpful to both sides with respect to the common threat of the Soviet Union."[119]

SAVAK was affiliated with the Office of the Prime Minister. Its chief was directly appointed by the Shah and held the position of assistant to the Prime Minister. From its establishment, SAVAK bore a principal responsibility for all types of intelligence and counter-espionage activities; for preventing subversion, sabotage, and all such activities harmful to the security and independence of the State; and

for checking and prosecuting all Iranian groups and individuals opposing the Shah's regime. Its officials were members of armed forces, and by virtue of its duties, it shouldered many civilian responsibilities, thus becoming, by far the most efficient organization in Iran. It soon grew to become a brutal force in running the affairs of the state, under the Shah's direct control.[120]

The Shah had also exercised control over the military and the security forces through a policy of divide and rule, which assigned overlapping duties to separate organizations for gathering intelligence. The Shah divided the SAVAK into three different branches. The first branch operated an extensive network of intelligence gathering units. The second one was a special intelligence bureau of SAVAK and was headed by the Shah's former classmate and trusted friend, Hossein Fardoust. The Third was an armed force branch which was charged with the same functions as the other two branches. There were also more divisions, inside these branches. These divisions included the town and city police, Imperial Guard, Gendarmeries and Military Police.[121]

With these overlapping duties and functions, and acute rivalry among senior officers leading these organizations, there was very little chance of any development, within or outside the military, not reported to the Shah.

Now, the Shah achieved his biggest dream. By having a strong military force and sophisticated intelligence organization, the Shah became the most powerful man in the region. His power permitted him to play a complex game in which his personal ambitions could be accommodated, while ensuring a congruence of American and other interests with the goal

and objectives of his government. The Shah's ambition was an exercise in joint ventures and jointly perceived benefits which included: the establishment of escape routes for Soviet defectors wishing to flee to the West, reverse penetration routes for intelligence collection, reconnaissance missions into Soviet territory, the establishment of border listening posts to intercept Soviet communications, the launching of joint exercises to counter the efforts of Arab terrorists to destabilize sensitive geographic areas, and the sharing of intelligence estimates on particular countries of mutual concern to Tehran and Washington.

It is a new world that calls for a new American foreign policy--a policy based on constant decency in its values and an optimism in our historical vision.

President Carter's Address on Foreign Affairs, University of Notre Dame, May 22, 1977

VI. THE THIRD SHIFT

In the second shift of American strategic policy, the relationship between America and the Shah developed rapidly because of mutual interest and needs between America and the Shah's regime. It was clear that American interests in the Persian Gulf were closely linked not only with Iran, but also with the Shah's regime. This close identity was a feature of the years from 1953 to 1976 as well. Because of this closeness, it was becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish American interests from those of the Shah. American strategic policy in that period was concerned with the necessity of supporting the Shah's regime.

Carter's human rights policy brought about the third shift in American strategic policy. In this shift, there were major changes in American foreign policy and a new set of values upon which the policy would concentrate.

The appearance of open opposition to the Shah would have likely occurred in any case, but its form and timing were, to some degree, a consequence of the human-rights policy created by President Carter. Also, the division and the confusion within the Carter Administration, over which policy should be followed in Iran, gave the opposition a golden opportunity to attack the Shah's regime.

Carter's Human-Rights Policy and the Shah

The human-rights policy gave American foreign policy a new image. Carter hoped that the expansion of human rights would be the wave of the future throughout the world and he wanted the United States to be on the crest of this movement. President Carter in his Keeping Faith (1982),

explained the aims of human rights. He wrote that "Human rights was not merely a matter of reducing the incidence of summary executions or torture of political prisoners. It also included the promotion of democratic principles..."[122] Carter's aim was to change America's image throughout Africa and the rest of the Third World. Carter wanted to give the people and the governments in these countries a new confidence in America. He wished to find valuable friends among peoples who had looked upon our country with suspicion and fear. Carter added that those regimes which were guilty of violating basic human rights, might be deprived of American support:

> I was determined to combine support for our more authoritarian allies and friends with the effective promotion of human rights within their countries. By inducing them to change their recessive policies we would be enhancing freedom and democracy... The world was too complex to respond to the application of a few simple rules. But when our own friends committed serious violations of human rights, their abuses have to be acknowledged, and they would have to be encouraged to change their policies. There would also be cases when oppressed people could obtain freedom only by changing their own laws or leaders.[123]

Carter wrote that his major goal was to protect the peoples' basic rights. He said that he was often criticized, in the United States and abroad, for aggravating other government leaders and straining international relations. According to Carter, this group of critics did not really understand his major intention which was to help the people who were imprisoned or tortured or otherwise deprived of basic rights. Carter admitted that his policy did not stop the violation of human rights: "The abuse of human rights is still a serious problem in too many lands. The world cannot be improved by one dramatic act or by one nation's transient policy; the wheels of justice turn slowly--often very slowly."[124]

Carter's human-rights policy was unique throughout the world. He had made a big shift in American foreign policy. The human-rights policy attempted to reduce the level of military assistance programs, while simultaneously increasing appropriations in the area of economic and humanitarian assistance. In other words, American economic aid could be used to improve human rights standards of the Third World countries in Latin America, Africa and the Middle East.

Before he came into office, President Carter had studied the record of abuses in different nations. Carter said that his source of information was the United Nations, Amnesty International and other organizations. Because of close ties between the U.S. and Iran, Carter put special emphasis on the Iranian case. Earlier, in the 1976 presidential election, the President, specifically named Iran as one of the countries in which America should do more to help protect civil and political liberties. When Carter became president, he questioned Iran's human rights record.[125]

From the beginning, the new administration in Washington pressed the Shah's regime to liberalize. Carter's human-rights policy had an immediate impact on both the Shah and the opposition. The former felt that the new president expected him to display at least some respect for political liberties. The latter also felt that the White House was willing to protect moderate dissenters from SAVAK onslaughts.

Carter's human-rights program probably encouraged the intellectuals in Iran to exchange and petition their protests, an activity which, in the past, would probably have involved jail sentences. Now petitions brought no immediate punishment, and although they were not published

in the press or elsewhere, they did circulate from hand to hand and abroad. At the same time, these intellectuals' protests circulated, pressure from foreign human-rights groups like Amnesty International, the International Association of Jurists, Iranian guerillas, religious groups and other opposition groups, kept up. Meanwhile, economic security and stability and social problems became increasingly acute.[126]

Amnesty International, which in the past had focused on political prisoners in the communist bloc, turned its attention to noncommunist countries and discovered that Iran was one of the world's worst violators of human rights. The more conservative International Commission of Jurists in Geneva took the regime to task for "systematically" using torture and violation of basic civil rights of its citizens. Also, the Unaffiliated International League for Human Rights sent an open letter to the Shah in which it accused the regime of intensely abusing human rights and called upon him to "rectify the deplorable human rights situation in Iran."[127]

International organizations criticizing the regime gave groups of Iranian exiles a chance to form their own human-rights committees that publicized the SAVAK atrocities. Forming committees in London, Paris and New York, Iranian students organized street demonstrations to expose the regime's unpopularity and tarnish the favorable image of the Shah through the western mass media, particularly in America.

The major aim of the Iranian human-rights groups was to utilize the American human-rights policy by publishing their grievances, hoping to widen the crack in order to change government policies. In 1977 several petitions and open letters were circulated. One letter, given

much publicity by the media, was from the leaders of the National Front. The letter was signed by men whose association with the Front dated back to Mossadeq. The letter criticized the failure of the Shah's reforms and particularly the disregard for human rights, enshrined in both the Iranian Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.[128]

It was because of the human rights situation in Iran that the Carter Administration was distant from the prior Kissinger-Ford policies. In early 1977, Carter's arm-export guidelines mandated that all sales be demonstrably in the national interest, that a quantitative ceiling be placed on them, that the government more closely supervise companies, and that the United States not be first to introduce new weapons into a region. That meant that Carter abandoned the 1972 United States-Iranian understanding and returned to the previous arms-sales-review process for the first time in a decade. Carter was attempting to make a gradual change rather than a dramatic change in Iranian-American arms sales. These changes in American foreign policy upset the Shah's regime and increased the Shah's insecurity.[129]

It was because of the pressure from the American administration and the Shah's confusion of the new American foreign policy that the Shah visited Washington in November 1977. Although publicly Carter admired the Shah and promised to support the Shah's regime, privately the discussion was totally different. In his speech in Washington, Carter described Iran as "an island of stability in one of the more troubled areas of the world." The President continued, "this is a great tribute to you, Your Majesty, and to your leadership and to the respect, admiration and love which your people give to you."[130]

Privately, President Carter, Vice President Mondale, Secretary of State Vance, and National Security Advisor Brzezinski had met with the Shah to discuss the Iranian situation. At that meeting, Carter expressed his concern to the Shah about human-rights violations in Iran:

> You have heard of my statement about human rights. A growing number of your own citizens are claiming that these rights are not always honored in Iran. I understand that most of the disturbances have arisen among the mullahs and other religious leaders, the new middle class searching for more political influence, and students in Iran and overseas. Iran's reputation in the world is being damaged by their complaints.[131]

When the President asked the Shah if there was anything that could be done to alleviate this problem by closer consultation with the dissident groups and by "easing off on some of the strict police policies," the Shah answered "NO!" The Shah added that there was nothing he could do about it because he had to keep those strict policies. The Shah explained that he had no choice but to be tough:

> I must enforce the Iranian laws, which are designed to combat communism. This is very real and dangerous problem for Iran and, indeed, for the other countries in my area and in the western world...the complaints and recent disturbances originate among the very troublemakers against whom the laws have been designed to protect our country. They are really just a tiny minority, and have no support among the vast majority of Iranian people.[132]

In that meeting, Carter was convinced that there was no reason to continue the discussion of the human-rights issue with the Shah.

Carter's disagreement with Iran's human-rights conditions, and his direct criticism of the Shah's regime disturbed the Shah. What worsened the Shah's insecurity was the attitude of the American Congress toward him. American congressmen began to question the wisdom of selling so much sophisticated weaponry to a regime that depended entirely on one man; Washington insiders began to refer to the regime as a "one-bullet"

state. After hearing evidence presented by Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists, the Chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on International Organization declared that the Shah's regime could not be considered stable until it permitted "popular input," created proper parliamentary structures, and allowed freedom of the press, discussion and assembly.[133]

In his statement before the Subcommittee on International Organization concerning human rights in Iran, William J. Butler, a member of the International Commission of Jurists, made the following recommendation to the Iranian government:

> The institution of one-party political system in Iran should cease, because, in effect, it deprives the right of Iranians to choose their government freely. We also recommend that the government transfer back to the civil court the jurisdiction of military tribunals over civilians, and to remove from the SAVAK the right to act as Iranian magistrates, thereby protecting the Iranian citizens at the time of arrest. We recommend the encouragement of greater freedom of criticism and comment in the press and other media. We recommend that Iranian Government grant a general amnesty to those arrested, indicted, or sentenced for expressing criticism of Iranian Government or its policies as distinguished from those who have incited or committed acts of violence.[134]

The impact of the Carter human rights policy on the Shah and Congress's dissatisfaction of the Shah's regime were great. It made the Shah aware of and made him face the reality of the crisis in his country. The American government and Congress indirectly implied to the Shah that there was hope in solving the crisis in Iran. They wanted him to focus on the center of the crisis which was the human-rights condition and political liberalization. Yet, the Shah still blamed America for his downfall. He said that Washington forced him to become too soft, and thus, encouraged the upheaval.[135]

The Shah was worried after his return from the United States. He was not worried about the demonstrations or the instability in Iran (he went through a similar crisis in 1953), but was worried that his American friends were not pleased with his regime. Thus, he wanted to satisfy the new administration in Washington. The Shah had a number of reasons for responding positively to external pressures. He did not want to jeopardize his "special relations" with Washington and his access to American arms. He was reluctant to lose the image of a forward-looking modernizer eager to bring the advantages of western civilization to Iran--an image he had cultivated at great expense in Europe and America. Moreover, he was convinced that his reforms were so popular that he could relax controls without endangering the whole regime; a decade of propaganda had managed to fool the ruler if not the ruled.[136]

Because of internal and external pressures, the Shah wanted to show a new flexibility. After his return from America, the Shah made a number of promises of liberalization, notably, free elections with a variety of political parties to occur the following year. In February 1978, the regime offered amnesty to 347 political prisoners. In March, it allowed the International Commission of the Red Cross to visit twenty prisons and see more than 4,000 prison inmates. In April, it permitted foreign lawyers to observe the trial of eleven dissidents accused of terrorism; this was the first time since the early 1960s that outside lawyers had been allowed into a military tribunal. In early May, the Shah gave a private audience to a representative of Amnesty International and promised to improve prison conditions. In late May, he gave

a similar audience to a representative of the International Commission of Jurists. In early June, the Shah dismissed Hoveida, who had headed the government for the previous twelve years, and gave the premiership to Jamshid Amouzegar, an American educated technocrat.[137]

This time (1977-1978) for the westernized and liberal Iranians was a period of euphoria. These groups believed that the liberal pressures and mass protests had sufficed to start the regime on a path of true liberalization from which it could not turn back, given the threat of renewed street action and external pressure, if it did.

It may be interesting to mention that throughout 1978 most of the westernized and liberal groups misjudged the situation; first, by thinking that the revolution would allow them a significant postrevolutionary role. But in July 1979, there was proof that they had almost universally miscalculated the situation.

The development of the Iranian situation surprised both the Shah and the Carter Administration. Carter's human rights and the Shah's "liberalization" increased the peoples' expectations and raised the number of street demonstrations. With liberalization, the Shah improved only his image. His slight liberalization encouraged the opposition to raise its voice publicly. The political groups requested a serious liberalization from the Shah. These groups specified their demands in a new open letter to the Shah:

> The only way to restore the national unity and individual rights is to abandon despotism, respect the constitutional laws, observe the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, abolish the one-party system, permit the freedom of press and assembly, release political prisoners, allow exiles to return home, and establish a government that enjoyed public confidence and respected the fundamental laws.[138]

Until the Shah's promises of liberalization in November 1977 (after his return from the United States), the opposition focused its energies on underground activities. But after the Shah's liberalization, the opposition overflowed into the streets in a larger demonstration. The Shah failed either to win over or subdue the growing opposition represented by massive peaceful demonstrations in several cities, with probably over a million people in Tehran.

To deal with the opposition and their massive demonstrations, the regime adopted a new three pillar strategy. First, it tried to intimidate physically the leaders of the secular opposition. Creating an underground Committee of Revenge, SAVAK sent threatening letters to the lawyers and writers who were prominent in the human-rights movement. In some cases, this underground committee kidnapped and beat up some members of the Writers' Association, and also bombed the offices of the political parties which opposed the government. Second, the regime changed some of its policies aimed at controlling the bazaar merchants and the moderate clergy. It called off the anti-inflation war against small businessmen, dissolved the notorious "inspectorate teams," offered amnesty to shopkeepers imprisoned for profiteering, ended plans for establishing grand state-owned markets and permitted the Tehran bazaar to form a society of merchants. Third, the new Prime Minister Amouzegar tried to slow down the rise in the cost of living by slowing down the economy. Unable to persuade the Shah to reduce the military budget, the Premier drastically cut civilian expenditures, especially the development plan.

Surprisingly, this new government strategy seemed to work. A good indication was the quietness of the streets in the summer of 1978. The summer quiet turned out to be the lull before the final storm. The crisis had only just begun.

The Division Within the Carter Administration

The rapid development of the crisis in Iran and the change in American foreign policy confused the Shah. He said, "I can recall nothing in the history of the world--not even the French Revolution--to compare with what happened subsequently."[139] The Shah's source of confusion was from the peculiar pattern of the revolution itself. Each wave of rioting was followed by a period of calm, encouraging Tehran and Washington, in their wishful thinking, that the movement was simply running its course before dying out.

Even though Carter officially supported the monarchy in Iran, the Shah feared Carter's human-rights policy. Also, he didn't seem to understand the American strategy. The Shah had no clear indication of the United States' intentions. The consistent message that arrived from Washington was the human-rights sermon, along with expression of support from the Pentagon and State Department representatives for Iran. The Shah's course of action seemed clear--attempt to meet the human rights demands. In that way, he would satisfy the Americans, avoid the open conflict that might jeopardize his son's chances for a peaceful and durable reign, and ensure that he would not be remembered as the man who had unleased a bloodbath on his country in his dying days.[140]

For the first time in his political career, the Shah saw himself alone and unable to solve the crisis in his country. The death of the

Minister of Court Assadollah Alam (the Shah's loyal friend) in 1978 increased the Shah's isolation, which was itself one of the reasons for the success of the revolution one year later. One characteristic of the Shah's behavior in this period was his distrust of the people around him, including the Prime Minister. The Shah, therefore, sought out the British and the American ambassadors for help:

> The Shah has asked our ambassador and the one from Great Britain to give him advice on how to handle the trend toward democracy and a more liberalized society. The Shah has moved very rapidly and has alienated a lot of powerful groups, particularly the right-wing religious leaders who don't want any changes made in the old ways of doing things.[141]

As the revolution approached, the Shah's nervousness about the American administration's intentions was matched by the opposition's hopefulness.

Carter's Administration was slow to recognize the Iranian crisis. The White House did not seem to understand the seriousness of the situation until November 1978, after months of riots and demonstrations in Iran. Although the administration criticized Iran's human rights conditions, they offered the Shah no other alternative. Both the Shah and the American administration exaggerated their expectations of each other.

In the beginning of Fall 1978, the Iranian crisis reached its peak. The American administration failed to recognize the seriousness of it. Even at the height of the crisis, President Carter had a hard time recognizing the stakes in Iran. The President and his staff were deeply involved in other "important" matters: Camp David and its follow-up, normalization with the People's Republic of China, and Salt II.

The Shah was very optimistic. He deeply believed that America would help him to solve this crisis; thus he was waiting. He was convinced that the American government had a grant strategy for Iran, even

though its outlines remained obscure to him. He was certain of the existence of an American strategy, for the geopolitical stakes in the Iranian crisis were so great that it was inconceivable to him that the United States had not developed such a plan. So the Shah was waiting for the American's grand design to solve his problem. He believed that if the Americans wanted him to remain, they were certainly powerful enough to support him, just as they had done during the Mossadeq crisis.[142]

The Americans, on the other hand, did not know that the Shah was dying from cancer. They also were slow to realize that his regime was imperilled. They considered the Shah as a professional warrior, able to survive this crisis as he had survived other crises before. Therefore, Carter thought that the Shah was better qualified than any American to judge and deal with his country's domestic uprising. Given the amount of power centralized in his hands and the limited capability for the United States, it was hard to see any other option. Carter did not believe in direct involvement in Iran. It was hard for some of the Carter people to believe that a leader such as the Shah, who had been on the throne thirty-seven years, and who had weathered many crises, could not manage this crisis. Also, they tended to believe in the Shah's leadership for the following reasons:

> He had created the Iranian government virtually single-handedly, possessed great wealth, excellent international connections, and the best-equipped, best-trained, most loyal army in the region. For years he had given Washington lectures on how to conduct policy. The man charged with the responsibility of protecting the entire region should surely be able to maintain his own regime on an even keel.[143]

Most of the experts on the Iranian crisis now agree that during the last eight months of his reign, the Shah was not functioning. The country, practically, had no leader capable of evaluating the situation and reacting accordingly. This was an even more serious defect because the royal dictatorship had inured its top officials into taking no initiative of their own, so that even at the most critical moments, they would wait for directives, which were slow to arrive.

There was continuous struggling and grouping going on in the American administration over the way that the administration should choose to deal with the Iranian crisis. For instance, there was substantial disagreement between the State Department and the National Security Council. That disagreement was known as the "Vance-Brzezinski" conflict.

Secretary of State Cyrus Vance sided with William Sullivan, the American Ambassador in Tehran. They believed that the old Kissingerian geopolitical view of the world had been abandoned in favor of a more moralistic approach. Thus, they argued that the United States could not give its support, under this administration, to repression in Iran.

Brzezinski believed that the nature of the Shah's regime was a distinctly secondary question, and that Iran was of such preeminent importance to the American Middle East policy that the Shah should be encouraged to do whatever was necessary to preserve control of the country.

James Schlesinger, the Energy Secretary and former Director of the CIA, was involved in this scenario and sided with Brzezinski.[144]

Brzezinski and Schlesinger believed not only that Iran's own strategic importance must be taken into account, but that the Monarch's collapse would also make Iraq and other pro-Soviet elements stronger in the Persian Gulf. If these elements became stronger, they might threaten the Gulf (most of America's western allies and Japan depended on the Gulf's oil), and the stability of the region. Therefore, the destruction of the Shah's regime might lead other Middle East monarchies to question the value of reliance on and alliance with the United States.[145]

The other side of the crisis within the Carter Administration was the way which the CIA dealt with the Iranian crisis. The problem with American intelligence--which itself was just a special case of the American policymaking--was not that it failed to foresee the coming of the crisis, but that it did not understand the crisis when it came.[146]

Until late Fall 1978, top CIA officials in Washington and Tehran, mired in part by their limited Iranian contacts, relied on SAVAK and Iranian officials for their knowledge of the opposition in Iran. It was obvious that SAVAK did not want to explain the depth of the crisis, because SAVAK was working under the Shah's direct order, and as has been discussed, the Shah denied (in the early stage of the crisis) the existence of the opposition.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee held closed hearings on Iran on September 15, 1978. When they asked the CIA director and former embassy deputy chief, why the government had failed to anticipate the Iranian crisis, both persons' answers were the same--because the CIA had relied heavily upon the Iranian SAVAK for information!

The CIA did not take the Iranian crisis seriously at all. Throughout most of the crisis period, there were just two analysts working fulltime on Iran, and for much of that period, there was only one individual following and analyzing events at the agency. For the most part, the CIA analysts who dealt with Iranian material were not Persian specialists at all, but rather Arabists. Even in December 1978, when the CIA organized a special task force to follow the Iranian revolution, the head of the task force was from an Arab state branch.[147]

In late 1978, Carter was worried about the development of the Iranian Crisis. He was surprised at the inaccuracy of the intelligence evaluation. Given the realization that valuable time had been lost, Carter blamed the intelligence service for not warning him earlier about the seriousness of the crisis. "On November 11, the President declared himself not satisfied with their performance on Iran."[148]

The President, also, was dissatisfied with Sullivan's performance as an American ambassador in that critical time. The main cause of the disagreement between the President and his ambassador in Tehran was that Sullivan disagreed with American support of the Shah. Sullivan had become convinced that opposition leaders had gained a much stronger voice in Iran's affairs, and thus, American should deal with them, not with the Shah. To do that, the ambassador insisted that the Shah should leave Iran immediately. The President rejected Sullivan's recommendation. The reason for Carter's rejection was because he believed that the Shah, his new Prime Minister (Shahpur Bakhtiar), and the Iranian military leaders needed American support, especially, at this crucial time.[149]

The conflict between Carter and Sullivan reached its peak when Sullivan asked the President, for the second time, if he could go directly to Khomeini in Paris to evolve some working arrangement with him. But the President, for the previous reasons, rejected Sullivan's recommendation for the second time. The President did not want to be directly involved with Khomeini. Instead, the President thought to ask the French President (Carter met with French and British leaders at a Guadeloupe conference on January 4, 1979) to mediate. This request made Ambassador Sullivan very angry. The President described Sullivan as illogical. Carter said that Sullivan, "apparently lost control of himself. Sullivan used such phrases as 'gross and perhaps irretrievable mistake,' 'plan of snaity,' and incomprehensible.'"[150]

The President wanted to fire Sullivan from his job, but later, because of Secretary Vance's interference, Carter knew that it would be a mistake to put a new man in Iran in the midst of the crisis. For Carter, Sullivan was unable to present an objective analysis of the complicated situation in Iran. Sullivan, also, was unable to provide the Administration with adequate reports about the military.

Sullivan was not the only one who had caused trouble for the President. There had been a group of officials in the State Department who opposed Carter's judgment and sided with Sullivan. To solve the problem once and for all, the President met with most of the State Department officials and told them if they could not support what he decided, they might lose their jobs:

> ...if there was another outbreak of misinformation, distortions, or self-serving news leaks, I would direct the Secretary of State to discharge the officials responsible

> for that particular desk, even if some innocent people might be punished. I simply could not live with this sitution any longer, and repeated that they would have to be loyal to me or to resign.[151]

What added to the complexity of the situation at this time was the Soviets' sudden warning. President Brezhnev warned the United States not to interfere in the internal affairs of Iran. He said that the U.S.S.R. could not stand for any military intervention to preserve the Shah in power. Carter responded to the Soviet threat by saying that the United States had no intention of becoming involved. He said, "I let him know that we would not interfere, but that we would honor our commitments to Iran and that we fully supported the Shah."[152]

After solving the conflict in his administration, Carter refocused on the Iranian crisis again. Carter assigned George Ball and General Robert Huyser to two different assignments. Mr. Ball was the former Undersecretary of State in the Kennedy Administration. Carter asked him to consult with the National Security Council in assessing what the United States could do about the troubles in Iran. Ball recommended that the United States encourage the Shah toward a broadly based civilian government, one in which he would surrender most of his power to a regency council. Ball's recommendation was similar to the one of the National Front, which was rejected by the Shah earlier. The Carter Administration didn't take Ball's recommendation into consideration because it felt that it still did not know the opposition very well, and thus, they could not trust it. Instead, Carter wanted to support Prime Minister Shahpour Bakhtiar. Bakhtiar, on the other hand, needed the military support in order to function. For that reason, Carter sent General Huyser to Iran to advise the Iranian generals to back up Bakhtiar.[153]

Bakhtiar was a sixty-two-year old scion of the powerful Bakhtiari tribe, a Sorbonne graduate, and a deputy minister in Mossadeq government. He demonstrated surprising strength and independence. He called for press freedom, the release of all political prisoners and the dissolution of SAVAK. While he waited for the Shah's departure, Bakhtiar also defended the importance of a smooth and legitimate transition. He said, "If the Shah fell now, the military would split into several factions, coup would follow coup and Iran would drift into chaos or civil war.[154]

For both Carter and Bakhtiar, it seemed obvious that the only solution for the crisis was to have a <u>united military in Iran</u>. That would only be possible by sending an American general who knew the Iranian military leaders in person. The responsibility of this person would be to strengthen the resolve of the military leaders, and "encourage them to remain in Iran in order to maintain stability, even if the Shah should decide to leave."[155]

As has been mentioned, Carter sent General Huyser on that assignment. Before his new assignment, Huyser was Deputy Commander of the United States forces in Europe.

By the arrival of General Huyser in Tehran, President Carter announced his full support of Prime Minister Bakhtiar's efforts to form a new government. Huyser immediately began talking to the ranking officers, looking for solutions for the crisis. But, from the Iranian viewpoint, "the Huyser mission was the first public indication that the United States was more than an interested observer of the current events."[155]

The Final Attempt

Huyser's arrival in Tehran gave the Soviets a good propaganda opportunity to attack the American foreign policy in the region. Typically, the Soviets did not like to see an American general in a neighboring country. The Soviets were nervous about the American interference in Iran because of their 1500-mile border with Iran. It was hard for the Soviets to believe that Huyser's mission was just a political one (or that he was there for maintaining unity among the Iranian armed forces). The Soviets seemed to be convinced that the real mission of this American general was to take over by some kind of coup. Ovchinnikov said,

> "...information is filtering into the press to the effect that, at the meeting with the Iranian generals, Huyser is also discussing plans for a Chilean-type military coup...General Huyser is serving as the coordinator of U.S. actions that are aimed at maintaining the present regime or at creating a new, but equally pro-American regime. In that light, the statement by U.S. officials about 'noninterference' in Iran's affairs looks less than convincing."[157]

Two weeks after his arrival, Huyser realized how complicated was his mission in Iran. He was faced with two problems. First, he realized that there were major differences in the way he perceived the situation and the way Ambassador Sullivan did. Second, the General was terribly confused by the speed of the development of the crisis in Iran.

As was mentioned, Huyser's job was to ensure that the military in Iran remained loyal to Bakhtiar and that it contributed to a smooth transition to whatever broadly based opposition regime finally came to power. He was also to assess the general morale of military leaders in Iran and try to unite them. According to Soviet sources, Huyser's mission was also to hold the armed forces together for possibly military action, such as a military coup.

Sullivan's views certainly were contradicting Huyser's. The Ambassador was well aware of the crisis. He knew the Iranian political figures personally. He was also well aware of the psychological strength of the military leaders. In the beginning of January 1979, Sullivan was convinced that Iran's political structures were breaking apart, and that the military leaders would not support Bakhtiar. For all these reasons, Sullivan stuck to his views, repeated what he said before, and advised Carter to deal with Khomeini and the opposition directly.

Sullivan advised the administration not to oppose Khomeini's take-over because his rule might lead to democracy, while Huyser thought it would lead to catastrophe and chaos. Sullivan believed that the military should stay neutral. Huyser believed the opposite and thought that the military should support Bakhtiar until a new constitution could be written and put into effect. The history showed that Sullivan's view of the Iranian crisis was much more realistic than the one of General Huyser.[158]

Huyser was not a specialist on Iran and he did not speak the language. He advised the Iranian military to remain united behind the Bakhtiar government. Unfortunately, his instructions contained no guidance on what to say if the government fell. He did not have enough experience or knowledge about the situation in Iran to give advice about the continuing disintegration of power in the military. For most of the Iranians, Huyser's mission was unknown. For the Shah, Huyser was a middle man between the military and the political coalition in Iran.[159]

The Shah, in his book Answer to History, wrote that he was astonished when he learned in January 1979, that the U.S. Air Force general had been in Tehran for several days. He added that he asked his generals about Huyser and his mission, but they knew nothing. The Shah believes that Huyser's mission was to "neutralize" the Iranian Army when demonstrations became violent.

When Sullivan went to the Shah on January 3, 1979, to work out the details of his departure, Huyser went with him. It was at this meeting that the Shah first learned of the general's presence in Iran.

Encouraged by Huyser and the U.S. Ambassador William Sullivan, the Shah went into exile on January 16, 1979. General Amir Hussein Rabii, Commander in Chief of the Iranian Air Force, before his execution, questioned the role played by General Huyser. He replied to his judges, "General Huyser threw the emperor of the country like a dead mouse!"[160]

General Huyser was not familiar with the nature of the Iranian crisis. When he came to Iran, the crisis was at its peak. Huyser had previously made several trips to Iran (before he was assigned to the mission), usually to discuss military contingencies and to study the way in which Iranian and NATO forces would cooperate in the event of an international crisis, but he had little knowledge of Iranian society, and did not speak Farsi. And, although Huyser had a fine reputation as a military man, he had not demonstrated outstanding political and diplomatic skills.

Huyser was probably not enthusiastic about the mission, but could not fail to obey an order. His instruction was somewhat vague, but the general direction was clear enough. It is unlikely that anyone could have performed this mission effectively.

Huyser flew to Washington and reported directly to the President that everything was going well, that Bakhtiar had every chance of prevailing, that the military was holding together, and that there was no need for drastic action. He did confirm that there was disorder in the streets, but that the opposition understood that the first step taken against either the government or the military would lead to instant reaction by the troops.[161]

Both President Carter and Bakhtiar had great confidence in Huyser. They believed, along with the General, that the military leaders were united, and loyal to Bakhtiar. The reality was different. There was already considerable contrast between some of the military officers and the religious leaders. These military officers believed that their chance for survival would be better by going over to the revolution than by fighting for a leader with a broken will. Thus, these groups of generals had made a firm agreement with the opposition. This group was headed by the Chief of Staff, General Gharabaghi, and the Court Inspector Hossein Fardoust. The Shah himself accused the two of betraying him. He explained his accusations by saying that all the other military leaders had either died or fled Iran by early 1980, while Gharabaghi lived on in uncertain circumstances and Fardoust had become the Chief of the new secret police, SAUAMA, which had replaced the old one, SAVAK.[162]

Interestingly enough, General Fardoust was the Shah's closest friend for almost forty years. Selected by the young Mohammad Reza, in 1940, to accompany him to school in Switzerland, Fardoust rose to the powerful position of Court Inspector, thus attaining considerable

influence over and information about SAVAK and the armed forces. He attended many of the crucial military planning sessions and was often consulted by the generals and by Huyser, when a major decision had to be made. Today, many of the survivors from the upper class of the Iranian military establishment are convinced that Fardoust betrayed them, and they see his present position as confirmation of his treachery.

When the Shah left Iran on January 16, 1979, he believed that his departure would be a temporary one. He thought that things would become so bad in Iran that the people would call him back. But, this was not 1953, and the Shah was wrong in thinking that history would repeat itself.

To strengthen the Bakhtiar government, President Carter, for the first time, sent Ayatollah Khomeini a message. In his message, the President encouraged the Ayatollah to support Bakhtiar and to give him a chance. Carter added that it was in everyone's interest to avoid an explosion and further bloodshed. Ayatollah Khomeini replied that the Americans should not support Bakhtiar. The Ayatollah declared that if America stayed out of the Iranian crisis, Iran, in the future, would become a reliable oil supplier to the West. Khomeini added that Iran might have a friendly relationship with the United States in the future, "if the United States behaves correctly, does not interfere in our affairs and withdraws the advisors who are intervening in our country, we will respect it in return."[163]

Bakhtiar tried to carry out his own negotiations with Khomeini. First, he sent a member of the government to negotiate with Khomeini. When this failed, Bakhtiar tried himself to meet with Khomeini, but the Ayatollah refused to meet him. He would accept him only if the Prime

Minister resigned. Bakhtiar refused to resign, but he said that the Ayatollah was welcome to come back home.

After fifteen years of exile, Ayatollah Khomeini finally returned to Iran, on February 2, 1979.[164]

If Bakhtiar held office, Khomeini held the power. The Ayatollah wasted no time announcing he would not negotiate with Bakhtiar. Instead, the Ayatollah declared Bazargan, the true Prime Minister. Bakhtiar fought back.

Bakhtiar was sure of military support because Gharabaghi promised to support him. Gharabaghi secretly negotiated with the revolutionary force because he was afraid for his own life and interests, but he also lost control over his officers. The armed forces, despite their large numbers and ultrasophisticated weapons, were traumatized by having to go out into the streets day in and day out to shoot down unarmed fellow citizens shouting religious slogans. The armed forces had to, for the first time, fight face-to-face with the guerrillas.

The guerrilla forces played an important role in destroying what was left of the Shah's Imperial Guard. In the last days of the Bakhtiar government, the guerrilla organizations and Tudeh Party delivered to the regime its coup-de-grâce.

The final drama began in Tehran on the evening of Friday, February 9, when the Imperial Guard tried to crush a mutiny among air force technicians and cadets at a large military base. As soon as the fighting started, the guerrilla organizations rushed to help the besieged cadets. After a while, the Imperial Guard withdrew. The guerrillas went to the base and distributed arms to the local population, and set up street

barricades. Early the next morning, the guerrillas and the air force cadets drove a load of weapons to Tehran University. The same day they took over the main arms factory and most of the police stations. The same thing happened in most all Iranian cities. At 2:00 pm, Gharabaghi, the Chief of General Staff, announced that the military would take no sides in the struggle between Bakhtiar and the revolutionary forces. Finally, on February 11, Bakhtiar announced his resignation along with the surrender of the armed forces. These three days of intense fighting had brought the Islamic revolution to an end and the 2,500-year monarchy to utter destruction.[165]

Once the Ayatollah had come into power, the Carter Administration adopted, what was felt was a moderate and cooperative course of action toward the new regime, maintaining food sales and supplying spare parts for military equipment. There are those who fault this policy, not only with the traditionalist argument that the U.S. was kowtowing to rebels, but also on the ground that the Americans did not understand Iranian society. Others argued that the administration felt the U.S. had good reasons--including the familiar strategic and economic ones--to develop friendly relations with the new Iranian regime.

Perhaps the trickiest question about U.S. policy was whether or not the American administration should have allowed the Shah to come to New York, the act that brought about the seizure of the American Embassy. That was a serious Carter mistake. That decision reinforced Iranians' fear that the U.S. planned to restore the Shah to power, as it had in 1953.

Many people analyzed the reasons for the Shah's downfall and its relationship with the Carter Administration. Each group saw the cause

from a different angle. Therefore, they ended up with different conclusions. The conclusions can be categorized into five different groups:

a. The Shah's enemies included leftist forces headed by the Tudeh Party, the National Front, minorities and religious opposition.

The Tudeh Party had opposed the Pahlavi dynasty since 1935. This party was controlled by the Russians since its creation. The reason why Tudeh survived all these years was because it changed according to the times and to the situation. Tudeh was like a laboratory for Soviet tactics and strategy in the whole region. To fit with the Iranian situation, this Marxist-Leninist party accepted the basic principles of Islam.[166] The National Front was seen as a one-time pro-Mossadeq organization which held power from the Shah in 1953. The central policy of the Front was focused on attacking the Shah's authoritarianism, the abuses of power by the SAVAK, and the corruption of the system as a whole. The religious opposition (led by the exiled Ayatollah Rouhollah Khomeini), on the other hand, had not only opposed the Shah's modernization program, but communism as well. All these segments of opposition made a common cause in resisting the Shah, and in 1979, they put all their differences away and destroyed the Shah's regime. After the success of the revolution, the leftists and the nationalists were expelled from power because of the domination of religious groups.

b. The royalist group (including the Shah himself) blamed the Shah's downfall on a conspiracy, hinting that American oil companies aimed to use the Shah in a scheme to raise petroleum prices. They claimed that Khomeini was too uneducated to plan a revolution such as the Iranian revolution. Without CIA planning, they thought the success of the revolution was impossible!

c. Henry Kissinger saw the Shah's downfall as an example of the weakness of the American foreign policy and clumsy tactical handling of the crisis by Carter and his administration. Kissinger said,

> "The Shah did not resist the opposition more forcefully because he must have had doubts about our real intentions. The liberalization strategy, forced on the Shah by Washington, was mistaken since an ongoing revolution cannot be moderated by concession. These can come only when order is restored. Whether we like it or not, the Shah was considered our close ally in that area for 37 years.[167]

d. George Ball blamed Nixon and Kissinger for the downfall of the Iranian regime. He said, "Building up the Shah as a regional power and disastrous encouragement to the Shah to overload his country with inappropriate military hardware, were the causes for financial crisis, unemployment, disaffectation, and an encouragement of the Shah's megalomania."[168] Ball disagreed with Kissinger's analysis and mentioned that the reason for the Shah's fall was not because of the Carter Administration, but because all Iran was against the Shah and also because of his army's disintegration.[169]

e. Finally, Zbigniews Brzezinski's analysis, which is presented in his Power and Principle (1983). Brzezinski was very careful throughout his book not to take any responsibility for the downfall of the Iranian regime (He was the National Security Adviser for President Carter). He blamed the Shah and American policy in Iran for the 1979 downfall. Describing the reasons of the downfall Brzezinski said,

> "...rapid modernization of a very traditional society breeds its own instabilities and revolutionary dynamics, that it requires a political system that can gradually enlarge political participation while providing safety valves for social dissatisfaction, that old religious beliefs should not be uprooted without gradual public acceptance of more modern values, including some genuine connection with the national

> past. The Shah's regime violated these basic rules, and U.S. policies throughout the seventies, including our own four years, could not and did not provide effective remedies."[170]

While the real reason behind the Shah's downfall will remain unknown, one thing is certain, and that is that the success of the Iranian revolution in 1979 destroyed the Shah's regime and with it the American influence in Iran.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

From the beginning of World War II until 1952, the United States had no serious intentions of becoming involved in Iran. The focus of American foreign policy was concentrated on the recovery of Europe through the Marshall Plan. American support for Iran during this period (1943-1952) was aimed at helping Iran in gaining its territorial integrity and improving its economic situation. This thesis attempted to describe the nature and the objective of American strategic policy in the period between 1943 and 1979. The thesis tried to pinpoint the shifts in American foreign policy and to indicate their effect on the Iranian domestic political development.

America's serious involvement in Iran started in 1953. This sudden shift in American foreign policy away from non-involvement occurred as a result of the following circumstances:

1. In the early 1950s, America recognized the strategic importance of Iran in the Persian Gulf. Iran's unique location in the Gulf and its large reserve of oil attracted the attention of American oil companies more than ever before.

2. Mossadeq's nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company shifted American attention toward Iran. The nationalization was a serious threat to all the western interests throughout the Middle East.

3. The Cold War and the struggle between the two superpowers in Europe and the Third World increased the importance of Iran (because of its strategic location) in the Gulf region.

4. American policy in this period was mostly anti-communist. Because the Shah feared the communist and nationalist movements throughout

the Middle East, he tied his regime with the United States. Because both the Shah and the United States had a common enemy, they worked closely to build a strong alliance. It was for the reasons above that the United States involved itself in Iran more than ever before. The American-Iranian alliance shaped itself after the overthrow of Mossadeq, and the United States started its technical cooperation and arms sale to Iran soon afterwards.

The Shah's objective in his plan for modernizing Iran was to serve his own and America's interests. The Shah's goal was to transform Iran from a Third World country into a strongly industrialized pro-western country. He succeeded in establishing his absolute rule in Iran by centralizing power as much as possible. He also succeeded in increasing Iran's control over oil production and pricing, and built up a large military power in the Persian Gulf region. The Shah was attempting to create a modern military establishment in a country that lacked the technical, educational and industrial base to provide the necessary trained personnel and managerial capabilities to operate such an establishment effectively. To reach his goal in modernizing the military, the Shah spent nearly one fourth of the total Iranian budget for defense spending every year. As a result, the Shah's overall policies of accelerated industrial and military buildup soon proved to be beyond Iran's capacity.

The Shah's plan to modernize or change Iran was weak and full of contradictions. The Shah's policies (economic and social) failed to achieve their own projected objectives. They were overambitious, mismanaged, badly coordinated, and poorly planned. The Shah's plans were

counterproductive in relation to Iran's means and needs. The rapid industrialization raised the people's expectations in Iran and increased their frustration toward the regime. The Shah was unable to meet the people's demands.

One source of the Shah's difficulty and inability originated from his frustration and the lack of understanding of the American system. This problem widened the gap between him and his American friends in Washington. The Shah did not understand the sloppy and uneven process that characterized a democratic society. Baffled by the presence of so many centers of real and potential power, confused by the constant outpouring of discordant views, frustrated by the slow march of legislation and even executive decision making, the Shah inevitably conjured up an unseen logic behind the chaotic appearance of events. Since the Shah made full use of all instruments of power in maintaining his own position and advancing the interests of "his" country, he presumed that the United States did likewise. Since he dealt with domestic opponents in summary fashion, he found it hard to believe that the American President could not always prevail on matters that the Shah believed important.

The majority of the Iranian people saw the Shah and his regime as a threat to their values and traditions, and thus, they regarded the Shah as a traitor. The Iranian people also felt that their cultural identity and traditional yearning for freedom and justice were seriously threatened. The Shah was the center of the Iranian crisis. The political unrest in Iran had its roots in his failure to permit the growth of responsible opposition to his own one-man rule. His commendable effort to modernize by educating his people and raising their standard of

living was impaired from the start by his refusal to allow a greater measure of political expression.

In the late 1970s, more than any time in its history, Iran had become the land of contradiction, bewilderment, destruction, and diversion. Economically, it was a nation of "nouveaux riches." Sociologically, it was a nation in confusion, if not madness; politically, it was a nation of phobias--fear of failure, fear of SAVAK, and in general, fear of the future.

American support, especially in the last twenty-five years, for the Shah's dictatorship, was one of the reasons behind the anti-American feeling in Iran. The Iranians saw the Americans as using them for their own purposes, because of Iran's strategic position. They saw themselves being used by the Americans as a gendarme of the region against Soviet or communist advance.

The Iranian people also blamed U.S. policy for Iran's economic crisis in the early 1970s. Large American sales of arms, agricultural equipment, high technology, and consumer goods inadvertently helped destablize Iran's economy and contributed to the Iranian revolution. The impact of the Carter Administration's stress on human rights had been particularly strong in Iran. Both the Iranian government and Iranians in opposition to the government had responded to it. The government responded positively and started some liberalization. The opposition, on the other hand, was cautiously exploring the extent to whch the government was willing to relax its control. In the beginning of 1977, both the government and the opposition in Iran were testing the Carter human rights policy. The opposition was expecting that the

situation might be changed to their advantage. The Shah was waiting for Carter to unveil his grand design. Carter, on the other hand, was confused with the contradictory advice which he got from the White House men. The conflict within the administration, the Vance-Brzezinski conflict, was the reason for Carter's misunderstanding of the Iranian crisis in late 1978. Carter's human rights attempt, the factionalism in his administration, and the Shah's liberalization helped the opposition in Iran to work more freely than ever before. Because of a combination of internal and external factors, the Shah's regime fell in 1979.

The American programs (military modernization, technical cooperation, agricultural reforms) ignored the fact that the people in Iran were predominantly rural with a wide gap between urban and country life. The development projects in the cities accelerated the urban drift, drained off from the rural areas much of the potentially talented human resources, and further accentuated the gap between rural and city life.

Another important point which these programs failed to recognize was the tempo and the rhythm of life in the Third World. The life of people in the modern world is governed by the clock and the calendar. The life of people in the underdeveloped areas was very simple and primitive. The religious feasts, the fasting, and the secular holidays in any of the societies in the underdeveloped areas were usually deeply entrenched, were full of meaning (both sentimental and religious), and were a strong, integrating force for the group. They conflicted with western concepts of efficiency and progress. The Americans hoped the people of Iran would adjust and conform to the tempo and rhythm of the western world. The Americans also believed that the people in Iran

were no different than those in America and other western countries. Thus, they pushed Iran toward modernization in an American way.

To most Americans, "economic security," means earning enough money to live comfortable and saving enough to live on in their old age. But, to the millions of people in Iran, economic security meant something much more immediate and urgent. It meant their daily bread--where the next meal was coming from. They needed American help desperately. They needed American help in learning how to produce more food and how to raise their standard of living. But did they really receive that kind of help, and did the American "Technical Cooperation" improve their lives? The answer to these questions is obvious. The American programs in Iran were not thought out very well, and suffered greatly from a lack of planning.

Effective projects should be planned on the basis of a people's existing social and economic conditions. Where the economy is still largely at the subsistence level, the emphasis should be placed first on smaller, consumer industries. Production of consumer goods should utilize skills, artistic tastes, and familiar materials. Also, programs should be planned in terms of the total requirement of a people. Industrial or agricultural projects should include plans for health and education services. Existing institutions such as communal work groups, social units such as the extended family, and established lines of authority should be adopted and utilized to the fullest possible extent.

It is necessary to understand the structure of any particular society and to grasp the points at which readjustment is required by the introduction of scientific knowledge and techniques.

The Iranian case was one of the most complicated cases for the American policymaker. Should a person ask if there is a lesson to be learned from this case? Iran is a dramatic example of the fruits of Cold War interventionist policies in strategic Third World countries. The royal dictatorship in Iran has its counterparts throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America, in government perceived by important sections of the public as loyal executors of U.S. policy. Regimes such as those of the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Morocco are similarly denied nationalist legitimacy, and they are parallel in vulnerability.

One of the problems with American policy in Iran was the fact that the U.S. Government always focused on the Shah's regime in formulating their policy in Iran. Instead of supporting the Iranian people and the opposition, the American administrations sided with the Shah. By the late 1970s, it was difficult for the Iranian people to distinguish between America's intentions and the Shah's goals.

The Iranian case should be a valuable example for future American foreign policy throughout the Third World. If the American policymakers use their experience in Iran, there might still be a hope to keep the Philippines on the American side. The American government should become involved as soon as possible in negotiations with the opposition to Marcos' regime. It is very likely that Marcos will be overthrown in the near future. Direct negotiation with the opposition might result in a peaceful transformation of the power in the Philippines, and a friendly relationship with the future government in that country.

It is less likely that the Reagan Administration will change its policy in the Philippines. When a reporter asked Reagan (during his

presidental debate on October 8, 1984) why the U.S. now supports the Marcos regime and why the Administration does not learn a lesson from the Iranian experience, the President's response was, "There is a big communist pressure on the Philippines government. We cannot stop supporting them; we do not have any other alternative."

Maybe the nature of the Philippines' crisis is different from the Iranian crisis, but it seems to be going through the same rhythm.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Donald N. Wilbur, Iran: Past and Present (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958), pp. 20-26.

[2] Amin Saikal, The Rise and Fall of the Shah (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton, University Press, 1980), pp. 19-20.

[3] Barry Rubin, Paved With Good Intentions (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 8-10.

[4] Loring Allen, Opec Oil (St. Louis: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain, Publisher Inc., 1979), pp. 40-42.

[5] Nikki R. Kedde, Roots of Revolution (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), pp. 107-109.

[6] Saikal, pp. 21-22.

[7] Kedde, p. 110.

[8] Saikal, p. 24.

[9] W. Churchill, Triumph and Tragedy (London: Cassell, 1964), pp. 85-92.

[10] Robert Graham, Iran the Illusion of Power (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978), pp. 55-57.

[11] Ibid., p. 55.

[12] G. Lenczowski, Russia and the West in Iran, 1918-1948 (New York: Ithica, 1947), pp. 170-195; Sikal, p. 25.

[13] Kedde, pp. 115-119.

[14] Barry Rubin, The Great Power in the Middle East: The Road to Coldwar (London: Oxford University Press, 1980), pp. 150-160.

[15] Graham, pp. 60-61.

[16] Ibid., p. 63.

[17] Ibid., p. 62.

[18] Gabriel A. Almond, The American People and Foreign Policy (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1950), pp. 25-32.

[19] Charles W. Icegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf, American Foreign Policy Pattern and Process (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979), p. 33.

[20] Townsend Hoopes, The Devil and John Foster Dulles (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1973), pp. 16-35.

[21] "X" [George F. Kennan], "The Source of Soviet Conduct," Foreign Affairs, XXVI, (July 1947):571-575.

[22] H. Stuart Hughes, Contemporary Europe, A History (New Jersey): Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976), pp. 453-458.

[23] John D. Stempel, Inside the Iranian Revolution (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981), pp. 59-60.

[24] Churchill, pp. 185-192.

[25] Saikal, pp. 25-31.

[26] Rubin, Paved With Good Intentions, p. 20.

[27] Jonathon Daniels, White House Witness (New York: 1975), pp. 221-222.

[28] Michael Kahl Sheehan, The Impact of United States Interest and Policies 1951-1954 (New York: Theo. Gaus, Inc., 1968), pp. 52-69.

[29] A. C. Millspaugh, Americans In Persia (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1946), pp. 60-80.

[30] Ibid., pp. 47-48.

[31] Ibid., pp. 96-118.

[32] Kedde, pp. 119-120.

[33] Benjamin Shwadran, The Middle East Oil and the Great Powers, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959), pp. 105-130.

[34] Saikal, p. 32.

[35] Lanczowski, pp. 220-222.

[36] W. Averell Harriman, Special Envoy to Churchill and Stalin, 1941-1946, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975), pp. 345-347.

[37] H. S. Truman, Memoirs, Year of Trial and Hope, 1946-1952, V. 2., (Garden City: Doubleday, 1956), pp. 94-95.

[38] Rubin, pp. 54-56.

[39] Ibid., pp. 56-60.

[40] Saikal, pp. 35-40.

[41] Michael Kahl Sheehan, The Impact of United States Interest and Politics, 1941-1954 (New York: Theo. Gaus Sons, Inc., 1968), pp. 52-55.

[42] Allen, pp. 40-42.

[43] Time (January 7, 1952):26.

[44] Documents, "Nationalization of oil industry in Iran." The Middle East Journal, 5(1951):353-354.

[45] Sheehan, pp. 55-58.

[46] The Economist (July 18, 1953):189.

[47] Saikal, pp. 38-41.

[48] Ervand Abrahamian, Iran Between Two Revolutions (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983), pp. 281-285.

[49] A. Kambakhsh, "Reflections on the History of the Tudeh Party," Donya, 7(Spring 1966)48-68.

[50] I.C.J. Reports, 1952, pp. 93-94.

[51] Yeun-Li Liaing, "The Question of Domestic Jurisdiction in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Dispute Before the Security Council," American Journal of International Law, 46(1952):275.

[52] Samuel P. Hayes, "Special Assistance to Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, United States," Department of State Bulletin 22 (February 6, 1950):214-217.

[53] Comment and Chronology, "Fall of Mossadeq," The Middle East Journal, 8(1954):69.

[54] Ashraf Pahlavi, Face in a Mirror (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1980), pp. 130-142.

[55] Christopher Tugendhat, Oil the Biggest Business (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968), pp. 137-144.

[56] Kermit Roosevelt, Countercoup, the Struggle for the Control of Iran (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979), pp. 6-16.

[57] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hearing, Mutual Security Act of 1954, 2nd Session, pp. 503-504.

[58] William H. Forbis, Fall of Peacock Throne (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1980), pp. 56-62.

[59] Shahrokh Akhavi, Religion and Politics in Contemporary Iran (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1980), pp. 35-41.

[60] U. S. Congress House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hearing, Mutual Security Act of 1957, p. 1, 215.

[61] Leonard Mosley, Power Plan, Oil in the Middle East (New York: Random House, 1973), p. 219.

[62] Mosley, pp. 223-231.

[63] Hans J. Morgenthau, Politics Among Nations (New York: Alfred A. Kopf, 1973), p. 86.

[64] Ibid., pp. 362-363.

[65] William J. Fulbright, The Crippled Giant: American Foreign Policy and its Domestic Consequences (New York: Random House, 1972), pp. 116-121.

[66] John Spanier, American Foreign Policy Since World War II, 9th Ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983), p. 51.

[67] Dwight D. Eisenhower, The White House Years: Waging Peace, 1956-1961 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965), p. 624.

[68] Spanier, pp. 51-52.

[69] Ibid., pp. 85-86.

[70] Norman A. Graebner, Cold War Diplomacy 1945-1960 (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1962), pp. 100-102.

[71] Ronal A. Paul, American Military Commitment Abroad (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1973), pp. 27-28.

[72] U. S. Department of State Bulletin, 28(February 9, 1953):212, (June 15, 1953):831-836.

[73] George Lenczowski, "The Soviet Union and the Persian Gulf: an Encircling Strategy," International Journal XXXVII, 2(Spring 1982), p. 309.

[74] Lenczowski, pp. 314-315.

[75] Graebner, pp. 130-145.

[76] B. Al-Awadi, The Arabian Gulf and the Law of Sea (New York: DeDroit Int. 1976), pp. 32-35.

[77] Awadi, pp. 35-39.

[78] Spanier, pp. 86-88.

[79] Edmund Ghareeb, The Kurdish Question in Iraq (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1981), pp. 135-146.

[80] Rubin, p. 101.

[81] Lenczowski, p. 311.

[82] Elie Kedourie and Sylvia G. Haim, Eds., Towards a Modern Iran (Totowa, N.J.: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., 1980), pp. 223-224.

[83] T. H. Unil Motter, The Persian Corridor and Aid to Russia (Washington, D.C., Department of the Army, 1959), p. 162.

[84] U.S. Department of State Bulletin, XX, 3(April, 1949), p. 432.

[85] Motter, pp. 55-62.

[86] David Wise and Thomas Ross, The Invisible Government (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 108-110.

[87] U.S. Office of Statistics and Reports, International Administration, Foreign Assistance, July 1, 1945 - June 30, 1966, p. 12.

[88] Walter M. Daniel, The Point Four Program (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1951), pp. 182-183.

[89] Louis W. Koeing, Ed., The Truman Administration (New York: New York University Press, 1956), pp. 262-273.

[90] Koeing, pp. 284-289.

[91] John C. Cambell, Defense of the Middle East: Problem of American Policy (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 49-55.

[92] Ibid, p. 93.

[93] Stempel, p. 65.

[94] H. Hekmat, Iran Response to Soviet-American Rivalry (New York: New York University Press, 1956), pp. 34-47.

[95] U.S. Department of State Bulletin, 23(March 1959):416-417.

[96] Stempel, pp. 69-70.

[97] Cambell, pp. 63-80.

[98] Abrahamian, pp. 419-420.

[99] Ibid., p. 422.

[100] Stempel, pp. 65-67.

[101] M. H. Al-Najar, The Geography of the Persian Gulf (London: University of London, 1971), pp. 291-296.

[102] Stempel, p. 71-72.

[103] David Schoenbaun, "Passing the Bucks," Foreign Policy, 34(Spring 1979):14-16.

[104] Stempel, p. 68.

[105] Saikal, pp. 58-60.

[106] Ibid., pp. 65-70.

[107] Radio Moscow, In Persian to Iran (Moscow: July, August, 1972).

[108] Added I. Dawisha, "Iraq: The West's Opportunity," Foreign Policy, (Winter, 1980-81):160-165.

[109] Saikal, pp. 139-148.

[110] Ibid., pp. 143-147.

[111] Raymond Vernon, Ed., The Oil Crisis (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1976), pp. 39-47.

[112] Allen, pp. 12-14.

[113] Vernon, pp. 113-114.

[114] Ibid., pp. 3-6.

[115] Rubin, pp. 123-125.

[116] Ibid., p. 125.

[117] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Military Sales to Iran, S. Rept. July 1976. Senate Subcommittee of Foreign Assistance.

[118] Stempel, p. 70.

[119] Ibid., p. 35.

[120] Cambell, pp. 55-63.

[121] James Bill, The Politics of Iran: Groups, Class and Modernization (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Inc., 1979), pp. 40-45.

[122] Jimmy Carter, Keeping Faith (New York: Bantam Books, 1982), p. 144.

[123] Carter, p. 143.

[124] Ibid., p. 151.

[125] Ibid., p. 144-145.

[126] R. K. Ramazani, "Iran's Revolution: Patterns, Problems and Prospects," International Affairs, XXXXXVI, No. 3 (Summer 1980), pp. 447-453.

[127] International Commission of Jurists, Human Rights and the Legal System in Iran (Geneva: International Commission of Jurists, 1976), pp. 1-72.

[128] Ramazani, pp. 443-446.

[129] Khosrow Fatemi, "Leadership by Distrust: The Shah's Modus Operandi," The Middle East Journal, XXXVI, 7(Winter 1982):54-56.

[130] The New York Times newspaper, 2 January 1978, pp. 2-12.

[131] Carter, p. 436.

[132] Ibid., p. 436-437.

[133] U.S. Congress, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights in Iran, 1st Ses. (Washington, D.C., 1977), pp. 24-26.

[134] U.S. Congress, Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights in Iran, 2nd Ses. (Washington, D.C., 1977), p. 8.

[135] Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, Answer to History (New York: Stein and Day Publisher, 1980), pp. 175-179.

[136] Fatemi, pp. 57-65.

[137] Ittilaat newspaper, 7 February - 25 June 1978.

[138] Abrahamian, p. 502.

[139] "Iran," Washington Post newspaper, 8 December 1978.

[140] Michael Ledeen and William Lewis, Debacle, The American Failure in Iran, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981). pp. 70-72.

[141] Carter, p. 438.

[142] Fred Halliday, "The Iranian Revolution: Uneven Development," Journal of International Affairs, XXXVI, 8, (Fall-Winter 1982), pp. 187-189.

[143] Rubin, p. 204.

[144] Ibid., pp. 217-222.

[145] Zbigniew Brzezinski, Power and Principle (New York: Farrar. Straus. Giroux., 1983), p. 357.

[146] Stansfield Turner and George Thibault, "Intelligence: The Right Rules," Foreign Policy, XXXXVI, No. 48(Fall 1982), pp. 124-126.

[147] U.S. Congress, House, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Iran: Evolution of U.S. Intelligence Performance Prior to November 1978, S. Rept. 1978, pp. 4-10.

[148] Rubin, p. 229.

[149] Carter, pp. 440-443.

[150] Ibid., p. 446.

[151] Ibid., p. 450.

[152] Ibid, p. 441.

[153] Fereydoun Hoveyda, The Fall of the Shah, (New York: Wyndham Books, 1979), pp. 182-187.

[154] The New York Times, newspaper, 30 December 1978.

[155] Carter, p. 443.

[156] Stempel, p. 160.

[157] Iran, "Well Then What is Interference?" (By V. Ovchinnikov. Pravda Jan. 13, p. 5) The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XXXI, 1(31 Jan., 1979):18.

[158] Carter, pp. 447-448.

[159] Stemple, p. 176.

[160] Pahlavi, pp. 185-187.

[161] Carter, pp. 449-500.

[162] Pahlavi, pp. 184-188.

[163] Washington Post, 2 and 18 January 1979.

[164] Iran, "Waiting for the Ayatollah," Time 5(February 1979), pp. 42-44.

[165] World, "A Government Collapses," Time 19(February 1979), pp. 30-32.

[166] Joseph Stalin, Marxism and the National Question, (New York: International Publishers, 1948), pp. 84-85.

[167] Rubin, p. 256.

[168] Ibid., p. 257.

[169] Idem, p. 257.

[170] Brzezinski, p. 395.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahamian, Ervand. Iran Between Two Revolutions. New Jersey: Princeton Universtiy Press, 1983.

Akavi Shahrokh. Religion and Politics in Contemporary Iran. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1980.

Al-Awadi, B. The Arabian Gulf and the Law of Sea. New York: Detroit Int., 1976.

Allen, Loring. Opec Oil. St. Louis: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain, Publisher Inc., 1979.

Almond, Gabriel A. The American People and Foreign Policy. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1950.

Al-Najar, M.H. The Geography of the Persian Gulf. London: University of London, 1979.

Bill, James. The Politics of Iran: Groups, Class and Modernization. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, Inc., 1979.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew. Power and Principle. New York: Farrar.Straus. Giroux., 1983.

Cambell, John C. Defense of the Middle East: Problem of American Policy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Carter, Jimmy, Keeping Faith. New York: Bantam Books, 1982.

Chronology and Comment. "Fall of Mossadeq," The Middle East Journal 8(1954):69-90.

Churchill, W. Triumph and Tragedy. London: Cassel, 1964.

Daniel, Walter M. The Point Four Program. New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1951.

Daniels, Johnathan. White House Witness. New York: , 1975.

Dawisha, Added I. "Iraq: The West's Opportunity," Foreign Policy (Winter 1980-81):134-354.

Documents. "Nationalization of Iranian Oil Industry." The Middle East Journal 5(1951):353-359.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. The White House Years: Waging Peace, 1956-1961 Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965.

Fatemi, Khosrow. "Leadership by Distrust: The Shah's Modus Operandi." The Middle East Journal XXXVI, 1(Winter 1982):48-63.

Forbis, William H. Fall of Peacock Throne. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1980.

Fulbright, William J. The Crippled Giant: American Foreign Policy and its Domestic Consequences. New York: Random House, 1972.

Ghareeb, Edmund. The Kurdish Question in Iraq. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1981.

Graebner, Norman A. Cold War Diplomacy 1945-1960. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1962.

Graham, Robert. Iran the Illusion of Power. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.

Halliday, Fred. "The Iranian Revolution: Uneven Development." Journal of International Affairs XXXVI, 8(Fall-Winter 1982):188-193.

Harriman, Averell W. Special Envoy to Churchill and Stalin, 1941-1946. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Hayes, Samuel P. "Special Assistance to Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs." Department of State Bulletin 22(February 1950):210-220.

Hekmat, H. Iran Response to Soviet-American Rivalry. New York: New York University Press, 1956.

Hoopes, Townsend. The Devil and John Foster Dulles. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973.

Hughes, H. Stuart. Contemporary Europe, A History. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1976.

Hoveyda, Fereydoun. The Fall of the Shah. New York: Wyndham Books, 1979.

"Iran." Washington Post. 8 December 1978.

Iran. "Well Then What is Interference?" (By V. Ovchinnikov. Pravada Jan. 13, p. 5) The Current Digest of the Soviet Press, XXXI, 1(31 January 1979):17-21.

Icegley, J.R., Charles W., and Wittkopf, Eugene R. American Foreign Policy Pattern and Process. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.

I.C.J. Reports. 1952.

International Commission of Jurists. Human Rights and the Legal System in Iran. Geneva: International Commission of Jurists, 1976.

Ittilaat newspaper, 7 February - 25 June 1978.

Kambakhsh, A. "Reflections on the History of the Tudeh Party." Donya. 7(Spring 1977):48-73.

Kedde, Nikki R. Roots of Revolution. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Kedourie, Elie and Sylvia E. Haim, Eds. Towards A Modern Iran. Totowa, N.J.: Frank Cass and Co., Ltd., 1980.

Koeing, Louis W. The Truman Administration. New York: New York University Press, 1956.

Ledeen, Michael and William Lewis. Debacle, The American Failure in Iran. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981.

Lenczowski, G. Russia and the West in Iran, 1918-1948. New York, Ithica, 1947.

Lenczowski, George. "The Soviet Union and the Persian Gulf: An Encircling Strategy." International Journal XXXVII, 2(Spring 1982):307-328.

Liaing, Yeun-Li. "The Question of Domestic Jurisdiction in the Anglo-Iranian Oil Dispute Before the Security Council." American Journal of International Law 46(1952):272-282.

Millspaugh, A.C. Americans in Persia. Washington, D.C.: Brokings Institution, 1946.

Morgenthau, Hans J. Politics Among Nations. New York: Alfred A. Kopf, 1973.

Mosley, Leonard. Power Plan, Oil in the Middle East. New York: Random House, 1973.

Motter, T.H. Unil. The Persian Corridor and Aid to Russia. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 1952.

Pahlavi, Mohammed Reza. Answer to History. New York: Stein and Day Publisher, 1980.

Palavi, Ashraf. Face in a Mirror. N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1980.

Paul, Ronald A. American Military Commitment Abroad. New Brunswick, N.Y.: Rutgers University Press, 1973.

Radio Moscow. In Persian to Iran. Moscow: (July, August, 1972).

Ramazani, R.K. "Iran's Revolution: Pattern, Problems and Prospects." International Affairs XXXXVI, No. 3 (Summer 1980):443-457.

Roosevelt, Kermit. Counter Coup, the Struggle for the Control of Iran. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979.

Rubin, Barry. Paved With Good Intentions. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980.

_____. The Great Power in the Middle East: The Road to Cold War. London: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Schoenbaun, David. "Passing the Bucks." Foreign Policy 34(Spring 1979): 14-20.

Sheehan, Michael Kahl. The Impact of United States Interest and Politics 1941-1954. New York: Theo. Gaus, Inc., 1968.

Shwadran, Benjamin. The Middle East Oil and the Great Power. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959.

Saikal, Amin. The Rise and Fall of the Shah. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Spanier, John. American Foreign Policy Since World War II. 9th ed., New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, 1983.

Stalin, Joseph. Marxism and the National Question. New York: International Publisher, 1942.

Stempel, John D. Inside the Iranian Revolution. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981.

The Economist, 18 July 1953.

The New York Times, 1978.

Time, 1952-1979.

Truman, H.S. Memoirs, Years of Trial and Hope 1946-1952, V. 2. Garden City: Doubleday, 1956.

Tugendhat, Christopher. Oil, the Biggest Business. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

Turner, Stansfield and Thibault, George. "Intelligence: The Right Rules." Foreign Policy XXXXVI, No. 48(Fall, 1982):122-139.